

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MARCH 25, 1876.

CURRENT TOPICS.

BARRISTERS LONG AGO ESTABLISHED their right to practise with the civilians in the Arches Courts, and there seems to be no reason why solicitors should not be admitted to practise with the proctors. On Saturday last, however, after lengthened argument, Lord Penzance decided, following the ruling of Sir R. Phillimore in *Burch v. Reid* (17 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 767), that he would maintain the vested interests of the proctors until the Legislature thought fit to interfere. The position of matters is, therefore, this—solicitors are authorized to practise in all ecclesiastical courts other than the provincial courts of Canterbury and York, and the diocesan court of London (33 & 34 Vict. c. 28); in proceedings under the Public Worship Act (37 & 38 Vict. c. 85, s. 11), and on appeal from the Arches Courts of Canterbury and York, but not in those courts. Sir R. Phillimore, in *Burch v. Reid*, expressed an opinion that it might be desirable to abolish this exception, and it is to be hoped that this will be speedily done by Parliament.

THE IRISH SOLICITORS are not to enjoy the same title as their English brethren, and, cumbrous as that title is, they are to have one still longer. Clause 84 of the Irish Judicature Act provides that "all persons admitted as solicitors, attorneys, or proctors of, or by law empowered to practise in, any court the jurisdiction of which is hereby transferred to the High Court of Justice or the Court of Appeal, shall be called Solicitors of the Court of Judicature." That is a considerable mouthful; but if it pleases any one there can be little objection to it. The good sense of the profession will probably in Ireland, as in England, make the pompous title a dead letter.

IN THE CASE OF *Patterson v. Wooler*, reported in this week's issue of the WEEKLY REPORTER, Vice-Chancellor Bacon has taken another step in the direction, towards which certain judges of the Chancery Division have steadfastly set their faces, of continuing the old system of affidavit evidence. In an administration action a motion was made before Vice-Chancellor Malins that the evidence might be taken by affidavit. The motion was opposed by trustees who were defendants, and who declined to consent to the taking of evidence by affidavit, and the Vice-Chancellor refused the application but reserved the costs. The case was subsequently transferred to Vice-Chancellor Bacon, and at the hearing the trustees did not contest the case and no witnesses were called. On the application of the plaintiff's counsel, the Vice-Chancellor inflicted the costs of the motion on the trustees who had opposed it. It must be admitted that, under the special circumstances of the case, there was substantial justice in the decision. There may have been facts which do not appear in the report, but, judging from the latter, it would certainly seem that the trustees had, by their re-

fusal, increased the expense of the litigation to the trust estate, and had done this without reasonable cause. The result of the decision, however, may be practically to nullify in a large class of cases the rule laid down by the Legislature. The Court of Chancery was always ready with its engine of costs to limit any enactment which threatened to infringe on the interests of *cestuis que trustent*, and the Chancery Division naturally follows in its footsteps. The process now adopted corresponds very closely with that made use of as soon as the effect of the Trustee Relief Act was understood. The Act said, "All trustees, &c., having in their hands any moneys belonging to any trust whatsoever, &c., shall be at liberty" to pay the moneys into court; but the court said, "Certainly, trustees may pay in the trust money, but unless they have reasonable grounds for doing so we will make them bear, at all events the costs of their appearance on the petition to get it out of court, and possibly also all the costs of the petition." So in the recent case the Vice-Chancellor, while saying that the trustees might prevent the evidence from being taken by affidavit, added that, having done so without reasonable cause, they must pay the costs of the unsuccessful motion to take the evidence by affidavit. From this it would obviously be not a long step to making the trustees pay the extra costs occasioned by the oral evidence. We do not say that the rule which the judges of the Chancery Division have laid down will be inconvenient, or that some provision aimed at abuse of the right to take evidence *viâ voce* might not properly have formed part of the rules of court; what we do say is that the rule now laid down is not to be found there, and is opposed to the principle which the Legislature has sanctioned—that every party to an action is entitled, as a matter of right, to have the evidence taken *viâ voce*.

WHEN WE WROTE some little time ago on Mr. Norwood's Bill we were not aware that its fate was already sealed. It has been vetoed. There has been brought to our notice a letter in the columns of a contemporary, signed "E. K. K.," in which we find the statement "I object to Mr. Norwood's BILL, and I have no doubt it will fail to pass." This should be a lesson to legislators who propose Bills for the consideration of Parliament without previously ascertaining whether "E. K. K." objects.

Mr. Norwood's Bill being thus out of the way, we are at liberty to consider the suggestions made by our contemporary's learned correspondent on "a subject embracing an extensive branch of law reform." That subject appears to be the banishment of poverty from the legal profession. "E. K. K." thinks there "should be no poor barristers nor poor solicitors," but he very unkindly leaves the solicitors to find out for themselves the best mode of attaining this result. His efforts are directed towards improving the incomes, incidentally of the outer bar, and especially of the outer equity bar, but mainly, as it appears to us, of the inner bar. The first step to be taken is, that "any junior barrister who chooses shall be at liberty, on complying with the regulations adopted for the time being by the Incorporated Law Society, to practise also as a solicitor, and that in this case he shall be able to sue for all fees due to him in either character." "E. K. K." thinks that "probably many men practising at the common law bar and going circuit would, out of delicacy of feeling decline to become solicitors also;" and if this were so it is obvious that a large field would be left open for the indelicate junior equity bar. But it will be satisfactory to the more high-souled part of the profession to learn that, somehow or other, in "E. K. K.'s" opinion, barristers who decline to become solicitors "would, or at least ought, to have a private income sufficient to support them." The prospect of this might be even better than the chance of becoming barrister-solicitors.

The other advantages stated as likely to accrue from the

proposed change are mainly the avoidance of "a vast loss of time, labour, and money;" but the chief benefit only becomes apparent when we turn to the next proposal, which is that "every barrister who practises also as a solicitor shall, on applying for a silk gown, *ipso facto* cease to be a solicitor." It is perhaps a little hard that mere application for a silk gown should compel the barrister-solicitor to take down the title "solicitor" from the door of his chambers; but the advantage to a new "silk" of having a large circle of clients under no influence but his own is too obvious to need stating.

But it is not Queen's Counsel alone who are to benefit by the scheme; the ingenious author has provided a means of raising the moral tone of solicitors. This is contained in proposal No. 3, which provides that "a Queen's Counsel shall be deemed to have committed a breach of professional etiquette, and shall be liable to be reprimanded by the benchers of his Inn, if he accept a brief without actual payment, at time of delivery, of the proper fee," except in cases where he may think fit to argue without any fee. How, our readers may ask, is this to prove a moral blessing to solicitors? We can only answer, in "E. K. K.'s" words, that the regulation is intended, "not so much to benefit the barristers themselves, as to prevent the demoralization which is occasioned to third-rate firms of solicitors by reason of the bad habit into which counsel have lately fallen of accepting briefs without the fee." We are a little puzzled to understand why "E. K. K." does "not think it necessary to extend to gentlemen of the outer bar" the benefit of this great moral regenerator; can it be that in "E. K. K.'s" opinion the iniquity of unpaid fees depends altogether upon the question of whether they are due to a Queen's Counsel?

THE SELECT COMMITTEE recently appointed to inquire into the position of the referees on private Bills, "and particularly as to the legality and expediency of allowing the referees" the power of voting possessed "by a member of Parliament regularly elected by a constituency," has presented a brief but emphatic report, to the effect that for a referee to vote is "inconsistent with parliamentary usage, and opposed to constitutional principle." The report gives references to most of the standing orders from which the referees derive their functions, and we cannot help feeling a little surprise that the practice complained of should ever have arisen. It must be borne in mind that it was not the practice of the Court of Referees in deciding questions of *locus standi* which was challenged. The members of that court—being "the Chairman of Ways and Means, and not less than three other persons" appointed by the Speaker—sit together and have always in a certain sense "voted," and will continue to vote, in the same sense as the members of any other court vote when the court is divided, but they do not, of course, entertain the question whether a Bill is to pass or not; they merely decide whether a particular body of petitioners is entitled to be heard in opposition to it; and also decide questions referred to them by the select committee on a Bill in the course of its progress. The three referees appointed by the Speaker may or may not be members of Parliament; and as a matter of fact, it appears that persons who are not members of Parliament, usually though not invariably, form the majority of the "Court of Referees." (See Clifford and Stephens' Reports, where the parliamentary status of each referee, if it exists, is mentioned at the head of each report.) The unconstitutional practice of voting which was challenged was exercised by these referees when sitting, not together, but singly with a body of members of Parliament, under a different set of standing orders. The presence of a permanent referee is obviously desirable for the purpose of giving some kind of uniformity to the decisions of committees, whose individual members are continually varying, and accordingly it is provided (Standing Orders 7, 107, 108, 113,

127) that committees on certain Bills shall be composed of four members and a referee; that certain unopposed Bills may be referred to the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, together with two other members not interested, or one such member and a referee, and that "all questions before committees on private Bills shall be decided by a majority of voices, including the voice of the chairman, and, whenever the voices are equal, the chairman shall have a casting vote." It appears that the referees' supposed right to vote has been derived from these orders "taken together." We should have imagined, however, that the designation of an equal number of members by standing order No. 107, coupled with the direction in No. 127 as to the casting vote, afforded evidence of an intention to debar the referee from voting; for the normal number, if the referee were included, would be unequal. A more careful consideration of these provisions would have rendered unnecessary the "instruction to be given to committees on private Bills"—"that the referees appointed have power to take part in all the proceedings of those committees in which they are associated with members of the House, but without the power of voting."

THE MIDLAND CIRCUIT reporter of the *Times* has suggested a new occupation for the official referees. "The state of the business here" [York], he says, "suggests the reflection that if official referees were of sufficient position to assist the judges upon an emergency by trying causes or prisoners at assize towns where the business happened to be heavier than had been anticipated, they would prove of great assistance in the administration of justice upon the various circuits." This is a very happy idea. Besides securing the services of the three experienced criminal lawyers who are to assist Mr. Dowdeswell, the cost of trying prisoners would probably be somewhat less than if one of the judges of the High Court occupied the bench. We presume that prisoners would be tried, according to the scale of fees recently published, at £1 1s. per hour, with a subsistence allowance for the holder of Her Majesty's Commission of £1 11s. 6d. for every night he was absent from London, and with, of course, in addition, a reasonable charge for his "locomotion."

The grand jury at Chelmsford on Saturday made the following special presentment:—"The grand jury desire to express their regret that the ancient name of this circuit has been changed, and still hope that ancient name may be restored."

At Hertford on Wednesday the grand jury made the following presentments:—"That the grand jury beg respectfully to call your lordship's attention to the fact that George Hill has lain eight months in prison on the grave charge of murder without trial;" and "The grand jury have the honour to present that they consider that it is inexpedient to alter the name of this circuit, and that in their opinion the old name of the 'Home Circuit' should be retained."

The Lord Chief Justice, in responding to the toast of his health at the banquet at the Maeson House, said, "I have had great encouragement, and great cause to feel that I have had all the support that I could possibly look for in a great and arduous office. I have had colleagues every one of whom has been, as it were, a source of comfort and happiness and support to me. I am glad to say that never at any time has the judicial bench of this country been more worthily or more actively filled than it has been during the last twenty years, or than it is at the present moment. I have had the support of a profession which, though there may have been giants in former days, is as worthy of the bar as at any prior period. I look back to the old days when I belonged to it with pride and happiness, and it has been a pride and glory to me during my judicial life to feel that the bar has always supported me and given me the strongest and most unmistakable marks of their attachment and respect."

THE NEW PRACTICE.

NOTICE OF TRIAL WHERE DEFENDANT HAS NOT ENTERED APPEARANCE.—A point of considerable importance has recently received an authoritative solution. Ord. 19, r. 6, provides that if no appearance has been entered for any party, every pleading or document required to be delivered to a party, or between parties, shall be delivered by being filed with the proper officer. The question has arisen whether a notice of trial is a document which must be delivered by being filed, and we understand it has been settled that it is, and that under the above rule the Record and Writ Clerk is the "proper officer."

ENROLMENT OF JUDGMENT.—The view taken by the Court of Appeal in *Hastie v. Hastie* as to the effect of the enrolment of a judgment of the High Court has fully justified the remarks made by us on the same subject a few weeks since (*ante*, p. 210). Among other points then suggested, we raised the more general question whether the provisions of practice which formerly obtained in the Court of Chancery, with reference to appeals from orders of that court, now "remain in force," for the like purposes, with reference to orders made in the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice. It may tend to remove the hitherto perplexing surroundings of that question, particularly as it may affect or involve the relative questions in reference to enrolling judgments of the High Court, and entering *caveats* against such enrolments, if we now refer somewhat more fully to the Acts and rules, the consideration of which had suggested the questions before alluded to. In doing this a comparison of the provisions of the Judicature Acts and rules with the provisions formerly applicable in the Court of Chancery may make the matter more clear.

One feature in the constitution of the High Court of Justice and of the Court of Appeal claims the first consideration. Each of these courts is a "superior court of record" (see Judicature Act, 1873, ss. 16 and 18), and, in the opinion of Lord Justice James, "the fact that the High Court has enrolled its own decree cannot affect the proceedings in the Court of Appeal, which is a distinct court." Then, again, section 2 of the Judicature Act, 1875—the section which temporarily preserves the jurisdiction of the House of Lords on appeals—expressly provides that an appeal may be brought to the House of Lords "from any judgment or order of the Court of Appeal"; and if only from any judgment or order of that court, then, if the enrolment of a judgment of the High Court of Justice barred the right of appeal to the Court of Appeal, the right to appeal would be taken away altogether. Next, the former practice in chancery permitted almost every order to be enrolled. The new provisions are absolutely silent about enrolments. In chancery a petition of appeal was preferred to the Lord Chancellor, and an order to set it down was obtained and served, a fixed sum of money being required to be deposited with the registrar to answer costs. Now, all appeals to the Court of Appeal are to be brought "by notice of motion in a summary way, and no petition, case, or other formal proceeding other than such notice of motion" is necessary—the notice being a fourteen days' notice from any judgment, whether final or interlocutory, and a four days' notice from any interlocutory order, and the registrar is to set down the appeal for hearing upon production to him (for filing) of the judgment or order appealed from, or an office copy thereof, and a copy of the notice of motion, and a deposit or security to answer costs will be required only in cases where the Court of Appeal shall, under special circumstances, so direct (ord. 58, rr. 2, 4, 8, and 15). In chancery a petition of appeal might be preferred within five years, and this applied (with very few exceptions) in favour of all orders made by the Master of the Rolls and the Vice-Chancellors. Now, no appeal from any interlocutory order, or order

made in the matter of the winding up of a company, or in a matter in bankruptcy, shall, except by special leave of the Court of Appeal, be brought after twenty-one days, and no other appeal shall, except by such leave, be brought after one year from the signing, entering, or perfecting of the judgment or order (see ord. 58, rr. 9 and 15).

The foregoing new provisions alone render the former provisions in chancery, in reference to enrolling decrees and orders, and prosecuting *caveats* against such enrolments, inappropriate and inapplicable to the judgments and orders of the High Court of Justice. It may, however, be added that the rules of court are also absolutely silent about entering or prosecuting *caveats* against enrolling the judgments and orders of the High Court, and upon this it may suffice to remark that the inconsistency of the old practice, when contrasted with the new, will be apparent when it is mentioned that the *caveat* entered in chancery secured to the party entering it the privilege of twenty-eight days after notice of Docquet left for enrolment within which to prosecute it—and this applied in favour of all appealable orders—while, under the new rules, there are, as we have seen, some cases in which an appeal cannot be brought at all after the expiration of twenty-one days, except by special leave.

The matter might be still more minutely discussed. The foregoing may, however, suffice to show the accuracy of the conclusions rather suggested than stated by us, viz., that "the constitution of what we may still call the intermediate court of appeal, and the very full provisions of practice in relation to appeals, are so entirely new, and have so little in common with former provisions in relation to the same subject, that a question may well arise as to whether the provisions of the former practice now 'remain in force,' especially having regard to the general principle now recognized as governing the application of the new practice where new provision is made." That question may now be considered settled, in *Hastie v. Hastie*, in favour of the exclusive application of the new provisions in such cases, and of the conclusion that neither any *caveat* entered, nor enrolment effected, can in any way affect the right of appeal to the Court of Appeal.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

APPEAL FOR COSTS ONLY.—JUDICATURE ACT, 1873, s. 49.—The above section provides that no order made by the High Court as to costs only, which by law are left to the discretion of the court, shall be subject to any appeal except by leave of the court or judge making such order. In a case of *Witt v. Corcoran*, heard by the Court of Appeal on Wednesday, March 22, a question arose as to the meaning of the section under the following circumstances:—A motion was made by the plaintiff before Vice-Chancellor Bacon to commit the defendant for breach of an injunction previously awarded in the cause. The following order was made:—"The court, being of opinion that the defendant has committed a breach of the injunction, and the plaintiff by his counsel not pressing to commit the defendant, this court doth not think fit to make any order on the motion, except that the defendant do pay the plaintiff's costs of the application." The defendant appealed from this order, without obtaining any previous leave from the Vice-Chancellor. On the opening of the appeal the preliminary objection was raised that the appeal was one as to costs only within the meaning of section 49, and the case of *Hop v. Carnegie* (17 W. R. 363, L. R. 4 Ch. 234) was also relied on. The Court (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.), however, were of opinion that the appeal was not one for costs only within the meaning of the section. Lord Justice James said that the order for payment of costs in this case was not one made by the court merely in the exercise of a discretion; if the court had not been of opinion that the defendant had been guilty of a contempt it could not have ordered him to pay the costs of the motion, any more than where a bill was dismissed the defendant could be ordered to pay the costs of the suit. And Sir R. Baggallay said that the introductory words of the order were really part of it; they amounted to an adjudication

that the defendant had been guilty of a contempt, and from that he was entitled to appeal. In the course of the discussion Lord Justice Mellish observed that an important question might arise upon section 49, viz., whether the old rule still remains in force, that appeals for costs only might be brought in cases where a question of principle was involved. This question, however, did not call for decision in *Witt v. Corcoran*, and perhaps the point may never actually arise, as, where a question of principle is involved, the court of first instance would, in all probability, at once give leave to appeal simply on the question of costs.

WITHDRAWAL OF COUNTER-CLAIM—ACTION BY DEFENDANT IN ANOTHER DIVISION—INJUNCTION—ORD. 23, r. 1; ORD. 52, r. 4.—The case of *Plimpton v. Spiller*, which we noticed last week (*ante*, p. 391) with reference to proceedings before the Master of the Rolls, came before the Court of Appeal on Wednesday, March 22, on appeal from the interlocutory injunction granted by the Master of the Rolls on March 16. The defendant Spiller had, in October last, commenced an action in the Court of Queen's Bench against the plaintiff Plimpton for slander of his title as patentee. In that action Plimpton put in a defence and counter-claim, by which he alleged that a patent of his own was being infringed by Spiller, and claimed an injunction to restrain that infringement. Afterwards Plimpton, without obtaining any leave from the Queen's Bench Division, abandoned his counter-claim, and commenced the action of *Plimpton v. Spiller* in the Chancery Division, in which he sought the same relief as that which he had asked by his counter-claim. The validity of the plaintiff's patent had been established in a previous action brought by him in the Chancery Division against another defendant, and, upon motion by the plaintiff in the action of *Plimpton v. Spiller*, the Master of the Rolls granted an injunction until the hearing. His lordship was disposed to think that it was not necessary, under ord. 23, r. 1, for the defendant Plimpton to obtain the leave of the court to withdraw his counter-claim; but he did not decide this question, it being a matter, as he said, for the Queen's Bench Division to decide. He thought, however, that it would be right that the leave should be applied for, and Plimpton's counsel undertook that this should be done. The next day the leave was applied for and obtained. The defendant Spiller appealed from the injunction. In support of the appeal it was urged that a defendant who had made his election to proceed by way of counter-claim ought not to be permitted at the last moment, when the action was ripe for trial, to change his tribunal, and thus to postpone the complete settlement of the matters in dispute. If he could do this once, he could do it over and over again, and thus one of the main objects of the Judicature Acts—the determination in one action of all the questions arising between the parties—would be defeated. At any rate, the granting of an interlocutory injunction was a matter within the discretion of the court, a matter of indulgence, and the court ought not to exercise this discretionary power in favour of a plaintiff who had adopted such a vexatious course of proceeding. The Court (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) were of opinion that the plaintiff had done nothing to forfeit his original right to institute proceedings in the Chancery Division. The counter-claim was now at an end, the Queen's Bench Division having, in the exercise of their discretion, given leave to withdraw it. Things were now in the same position as if it had never been made, and the fact that it had been made could now, at the most, have a bearing upon the question of costs. Lord Justice Mellish observed that very probably the plaintiff might have thought at first that the counter-claim was a proper way of raising his case against the defendant, but had been better advised afterwards. It would obviously be a most inconvenient way of establishing the right to a patent. The patentee being in the position of defendant, he would not have the right to begin, and the objections to the patent would be put before the jury in the first instance. It was not to be wondered at that he now desired to adopt a proceeding in which he himself would be the plaintiff, or, as the Master of the Rolls forcibly expressed it, that he preferred not having his case tried by an ignorant judge and an ignorant jury, meaning, of course, a judge and jury who were not familiar with the patent, as the Master

of the Rolls was from his having tried a previous action relating to it. To try the questions of the validity and infringement of one patent by way of counter-claim in an action for slander of the title to another patent would indeed, as Lord Justice James said, be to strain that method of procedure to the utmost. And the Court pointed out that the defendant Spiller's proper course would have been, after the commencement of the action in the Chancery Division, to move to stay all proceedings in it, on the ground of the pendency of the counter-claim in the other action. Lord Justice Mellish said that he did not intend to lay it down as a general rule that, where a defendant had put in a counter-claim, and the action had proceeded for some way towards trial, he should be allowed, as a matter of course, to withdraw his counter-claim, and to commence an original action of his own in another division. Whether he should be allowed to do so or not must be in each case a matter for the discretion of the court or judge. If the existence of the counter-claim in the first action afforded a reasonable ground for staying the proceedings in the second action, an order to stay them would be made on the application of the defendant in that action.

APPEAL—SECURITY FOR COSTS—LEAVE TO SERVE NOTICE OF MOTION—ORD. 58, r. 15.—Yesterday, March 24, in a case of *Grills v. Dillon, Colt*, for the defendant, applied to the Court of Appeal for leave to serve notice of motion that the plaintiff might be ordered to give security to answer the costs to be occasioned by an appeal from the judgment of Vice-Chancellor Hall of which the plaintiff had recently given notice. *Colt* stated that, according to the practice adopted in the offices of the court, such a motion would not be set down for hearing unless the leave of the Court of Appeal to serve notice of it had been previously obtained. The court (James and Mellish, L.J.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) were of opinion that no leave was necessary, and that this should be understood at the offices to be the rule in future. Their lordships directed this particular motion to be placed in the paper for next Wednesday.

EFFECT OF ASSIGNMENT OF CAUSES TO DIVISIONS.—On Wednesday, March 22, in the Queen's Bench Division (Cockburn, C.J., and Quain and Archibald, J.J.) sitting in *Banco*, in a case of *Pacey and Wife v. The London Tramway Company*, an action for compensation for injury, *Clay* applied by way of appeal from an order made by Pollock, B., at chambers, refusing inspection of a report of the surgeon of the defendants, who had seen the injured party. Cockburn, C.J., said that as this was an Exchequer cause, they were bound to follow the rule on this subject laid down by the judges of the Exchequer Division, and the court dismissed the application, intimating that the proper course was to go to the Court of Appeal, and his lordship added that it was important to know to what division any cause belonged, and it was desirable that it should be stated in the list of causes to which division they respectively belonged.

CITING TO SEE PROCEEDINGS IN PROBATE ACTIONS.—In the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division on Tuesday, March 21, judgment was given on an application in *Kennaway v. Kennaway* (*ante*, p. 373) for leave to cite to see proceedings certain devisees under a will propounded by the executor in an altered form. The president said he had considered the question whether the former practice had been altered by the Judicature Acts and rules. By ord. 16, r. 12, the rules as to parties which had been in use in the Probate Court remained unaltered, while r. 13 only provided for the adding, as plaintiffs or defendants, of persons whose presence before the court might be necessary. By the 20 & 21 Vict. c. 77, s. 61, devisees and others interested in real estate were not necessarily made parties, but had merely the option of appearing in the suit. The power given to the High Court by ord. 16, r. 13, of adding parties in order to do complete justice was not inconsistent with the practice of the Court of Probate, and the rule was an addition to, and not an alteration of, the old practice. He therefore gave leave to cite the parties named.

INJUNCTION.—In the same division on Tuesday, March 21, *Dr. Spinks, Q.C.*, and *Bayford*, moved, in the case

of *Watts v. Watts*, in which there had been a decree for a divorce on the ground of cruelty and adultery, for an injunction to restrain the respondent from selling, dealing with, or incumbering property which he had settled on his wife and children by a post-nuptial settlement. The respondent had advertised for sale a part of the real estate so settled. *W. Barber*, in opposition to the motion, urged that there was no jurisdiction in the matter, since the *cestui que trust* under a voluntary settlement could have no equity against a purchaser, and the court had no power beyond that which was formerly exercised by the Court of Chancery. The president of the division pointed out that the settlement was recited to be made in accordance with an ante-nuptial agreement, and he should presume that the latter was in writing. The burden of proof that the later settlement was a voluntary one was on the respondent, who had not established the fact. He, therefore, granted an injunction with costs.

THE IRISH JUDICATURE BILL.

THOSE of our readers who have followed with interest the discussions which have taken place in and since the year 1874 on the proposed changes in the Irish Judicature will, we doubt not, share in the feeling of disappointment with which we rise from an examination of this Bill. Granted that it avoids some of the faults which provoked so much opposition to the Bill of 1874, this has been done, we think, at a sacrifice of symmetry, not only unnecessary, but productive of defects even more objectionable than those which proved fatal to the former proposal.

We have no intention of resuming any discussion of the question, on which we have more than once expressed our opinion, whether any and what reduction in the number of Irish judges is or is not desirable; however that may be, some such reduction must now be taken to be inevitable, and the only practical question which remains open seems to be in what direction and to what extent the pruning-knife is to be applied.

The present judges of first instance in Ireland are (or would be but for the vacancy in the Court of Common Pleas) twenty-one in number, twelve of whom are divided equally amongst the three common law courts, and the remaining nine are distributed amongst a number of special courts, all of which are, however, essentially of an equitable or administrative character. From these nine it is proposed to withdraw one, the Lord Chancellor, for the purpose of confining him entirely (or with an immaterial exception) to the Court of Appeal, and it is intended gradually to reduce the remaining eight by four, so that, when all the proposed changes are carried into effect, the court will consist of sixteen judges arranged in four divisions of four judges each. This, we may remark, is one judge more than was proposed in 1874, and to this extent the present Bill may be considered to have deferred to the strong opinions expressed by the press and the profession in Ireland. So far, therefore, the Bill does not seem open to remark; and we cannot but admit that, if properly distributed, all the business likely to come before the High Court of Justice in Ireland ought to be easily and efficiently disposed of by sixteen judges.

But in the scheme by which this reduction in the number of judges is to be effected and the proposed re-distribution of judicial work, we are unable to concur. The most reasonable and natural course would, we think, have been at once to collect the eight judges in question in the Chancery Division of the proposed High Court, and to give to each of those judges (subject to proper arrangements for saving the rights of existing judges) all the jurisdiction now divided amongst the four different courts, which would thus have been consolidated. Due provision might then have been made for reducing the number of these judges as vacancies occur so as eventually to reduce them to four, a Master of the Rolls and three Vice-Chancellors, who should each be competent to exercise all

the jurisdiction now vested in the several Courts of Chancery, Landed Estates, and Probate, and to some one of whom should further be intrusted the duties of judge of the Dublin Court of Bankruptcy. If the project of establishing distinct courts of bankruptcy at Belfast and Cork, so strongly advocated by the Chambers of Commerce of both those places, should be carried into effect, the business remaining for the Dublin court could be easily performed by one judge, without any delegation to registrars or others, who would still have a considerable portion of spare time to devote to the general duties of a judge of the division. The business of the Court of Admiralty in Ireland is not sufficient to occupy the time of a separate judge, and there does not seem to be any reason why it should be attributed to any one division or judge more than any other, and we should suggest that, subject to the tenure of office of the existing judge, plaintiffs in admiralty causes should be left to mark their writs of summons for any division they please. This would, at no distant period, produce precisely the same result, so far as reduction in number of judges is concerned, as the arrangement proposed in the present Bill, without the incongruous severance of probate and bankruptcy from the other departments of equity in a manner which, if not adopted purely at hap-hazard, at any rate can be referred to no intelligible principle of arrangement. We may guess that the transfer of the probate judge and business to the Common Pleas was suggested, either to avoid the necessity of filling up the existing vacancy in that court, or for the charitable purpose of supplying the judges with something in the way of occupation; and similarly we may surmise that the Court of Exchequer has been selected as the haven of refuge for the bankruptcy business in imitation of the provision to that effect which has been so happily expunged from the Act of 1873; but beyond their inherent probability we have no warrant for either of these conjectures, and we certainly do not think they would constitute, if well founded, any sufficient justification for the course proposed. The case of the existing vacancy would be easily met by appointing one of the existing bankruptcy judges to the Common Pleas, and requiring the judge of probate to undertake, in addition to his present work, so much of the bankruptcy business as the remaining judge was unable to get through. This would be no greater encroachment on his present rights than is involved in the proposal to transfer him, jurisdiction and all, to the Common Pleas, and his consent to the one transfer could be obtained just as easily as to the other.

But the most objectionable feature, as it seems to us, of the present Bill is the proposal to perpetuate the separate jurisdiction of the Landed Estates Court. True, the judges of that court are to become judges of the Chancery Division, and to exercise a general jurisdiction in equity, but the peculiar power of selling land with a parliamentary title is to be retained by them, instead of being shared, as it ought to be, with all the other judges of the division. If the Bill passes in its present shape, the devisees in trust of a man who has directed a sale of his real estates for payment of his debts and distribution of the surplus among his children, will still have to institute three separate proceedings; first, to obtain probate of his will; secondly, having done so, to get an order for administration, including a direction to sell his real estate, from a judge of the Chancery Division; and thirdly, to file a petition addressed to one of the Landed Estates Court judges for a judicial sale in compliance with that order, with a reference back to the equity judge for distribution of the ultimate proceeds of sale. And, as we read the Bill, this third proceeding will be equally necessary, and equally an independent and separate proceeding, whether the equity suit had been heard before one of the Landed Estates judges or before any other judge of the division. Under the other arrangement one suit instituted in the Chancery Division and marked for any judge of

that division would enable the plaintiffs to obtain complete administration of the estate from probate of the will, contested or uncontested, down to final division of the proceeds of sale amongst the beneficiaries under the will.

We trust that, the present apparent harmony notwithstanding, the Bill will not be suffered to pass into law without considerable modification in these and other respects; but we must defer our remarks upon the rest of the measure till a future opportunity.

REPUTED OWNERSHIP.

II.

THE second of the three requisites in order to bringing the reputed ownership clause into operation is the consent of the true owner. As to this it may be remarked that the consent must not be merely to possession of the goods by the bankrupt, but to possession of them by him in the capacity of *reputed owner*. It is apparently upon this ground that the long-established exemption of trust property in the possession of the bankrupt is founded, and this explains a limitation to the exemption which has only recently been placed on its true footing. The exemption only extends to cases of trusts *bonâ fide* created, and does not cover cases where the forms of a trust are gone through merely to conceal the true ownership of the property, since in those cases the essence of the arrangement between the true owner and the bankrupt is that the latter shall have possession of the goods in the capacity of reputed owner. Thus in *Ex parte Watkins* (2 Mont. & A. 348), a person bought six shares in an assurance company under the rules of which no person other than a director could hold in his own name more than two shares, and he had two of them placed in the name of the bankrupt, who was treated on all occasions as the only apparent owner, and had possession of the certificates of the shares; it was held that the shares were in the reputed ownership of the bankrupt. (See also *Ex parte Ord*, *Ibid.* 724). In the recent case of *Great Eastern Railway Company v. Turner* (21 W. R. 163, L. R. 8 Ch. 149) it was attempted to extend this doctrine to the case of shares which had been purchased with the funds of a company which had no power to purchase such shares, and were standing in the name of the bankrupt, as chairman of the company. The answer to this contention given by the Court of Appeal was that, the purchase of the shares being *ultra vires*, there was no possession of them with the consent of the true owner.

It may be added that it is well settled that a mere demand of possession made *bonâ fide* before bankruptcy and without notice of any act of bankruptcy amounts to a revocation of the consent of the true owner, and thus enables him to defeat the operation of the clause. See, for a recent instance, *Ex parte Ward, In re Couston* (21 W. R. 115, L. R. 8 Ch. 144).

This brings us to a discussion of the third of the before-mentioned requisites, viz., reputation of ownership. The books are full of cases on this subject from which some important general principles may be deduced. *Prima facie*, possession is evidence of the ownership of goods. There are many cases, however, in which possession is "too equivocal to create the reputation of ownership," and in this point of view the notoriety of trade customs becomes a very material element. These customs may relate either to the leaving of goods after sale in the possession of the vendor for the convenience of the purchaser, or to the hiring of chattels by a trader for the purposes of his trade, or to the placing of chattels by a customer in the hands of a trader for a temporary purpose, in order, for instance, that they may be altered or repaired. A familiar instance of the latter class of cases is supplied by the custom of leaving clocks or watches with the clock or watch maker to be cleaned or repaired. This is so well known to all the world that it could never be supposed that the creditors

of a watchmaker had trusted him upon the faith of all the watches in his shop being his own property. And, accordingly, in *Hamilton v. Bell* (10 Ex. 545) it was held that clocks left after they had been purchased by a customer with the maker, in order that they might be cleaned and repaired before delivery, did not pass to the vendor's assignees in bankruptcy. And in the more recent case of *Priestly v. Pratt* (15 W. R. 639, L. R. 2 Ex. 101) the same principle was applied to the leaving of lambs and pigs by the purchaser on the vendor's farm until it should suit the convenience of the purchaser to remove them. The custom which prevailed against the reputed ownership clause in *Hamilton v. Bell* was not a mere trade custom, but a custom which may be taken to be known to every one. A mere trade custom, i.e., a custom known only to the persons dealing in a particular trade, is, however, sufficient for the purpose, provided that it be notorious to all persons dealing in the trade. Though there are a great many reported cases on this point it was not till recently that the question came before the Court of Appeal, in the well-known case of *Ex parte Watkins* (21 W. R. 530, L. R. 8 Ch. 520), in which, overruling an old case of *Knowles v. Horsfall* (5 B. & A. 134), the court held that a custom notorious among all the persons concerned in a particular trade, but unknown to the rest of the world, was sufficient to exclude a reputation of ownership arising from the possession of goods. In three subsequent cases before the Court of Appeal the principle of this decision has been clearly explained. The first of these, *Ex parte Vaux* (22 W. R. 811, L. R. 9 Ch. 602), differed from *Ex parte Watkins* in this respect, that the goods, instead of being in the bonded warehouse of the vendor, were in the warehouse of a third party, standing to the order of the vendor. But the Court of Appeal held that this distinction was immaterial, and treated *Ex parte Watkins* as an authority for the broad proposition that (in the words of Lord Justice Mellish) "it is enough to prove the custom of the particular trade, because the creditors of a trader are mostly persons engaged in the same trade, or bankers or other persons who are acquainted with the custom of that particular trade." In the second of these cases, *Ex parte Press* (not reported), Lord Justice Mellish said that the custom relied on must be proved to prevail to such an extent that it might be reasonably inferred that the trade creditors of the bankrupt had knowledge of it. In that case it was attempted to prove that it was notorious in the trade that carriage builders let out cabs to cab proprietors at a monthly rent, with an option to purchase them at a specified price within twelve months from the date of the agreement. The agreement amounted in effect to an arrangement for payment of the purchase-money by instalments, with a proviso that the property should not pass until all the instalments had been paid. The Chief Judge held that the custom had been sufficiently proved; the Court of Appeal thought that the evidence only proved that the carriage builder was endeavouring to bring this system of hire and purchase into common use, and said that a man could not be permitted to make a custom for himself. In the still more recent case of *Ex parte Powell* (noted ante, p. 137), the custom alleged was the hiring out of furniture, with an option of purchase, upon an arrangement similar to that which was made in *Ex parte Press* with regard to cabs, the bankrupt having been an hotel-keeper, and the court said that it was not enough to prove that the alleged custom was well known to furniture dealers; it must be proved that it was so notorious that it must be inferred that it was known to the ordinary trade creditors of an hotel-keeper, such as his wine merchant, his butcher, and his baker. In *Ex parte Powell* the Chief Judge had decided in favour of the real owner of the furniture, on the ground that the custom of letting furniture on hire had been so often proved in the Court of Bankruptcy that the court ought to take judicial notice of its existence. The Court of Appeal admitted that if a custom had been very often proved the Court of Bankruptcy should take judicial notice of it, in

the same way as the courts of common law have been in the habit of taking judicial notice of frequently proved mercantile customs, but they held that, though the custom of letting furniture in furnished houses might be notorious, the custom set up in the particular case was one of a totally different nature. In *Re Hawkins* (20 W. R. 110), the Chief Judge held that the hired furniture of a dwelling-house was not in the reputed ownership of the hirer. But in *Ex parte Lovering* (22 W. R. 853, L. R. 9 Ch. 621), the Court of Appeal decided that an agreement by which a tradesman sold his furniture, and hired it back from the purchaser at a weekly rent, never parting with the possession, did not operate to deprive him of the reputation of ownership.

The result of the authorities on this head seems to be this:—Possession affords a *prima facie* presumption of ownership, but this presumption may be rebutted by evidence. Where the bankrupt was the original owner of the goods stronger evidence is necessary to rebut the presumption than where he has never been the real owner. In either case evidence of a long-established and notorious custom, even though it be the custom only of a particular trade, is enough. But the custom must be proved to have been so long established and so widely known as that it may be reasonably presumed that all the trade creditors of the bankrupt are aware of it. And the court will take judicial notice of a trade custom which has been often proved in previous cases.

Recent Decisions.

MORTGAGEE'S COVENANT NOT TO CALL IN.

(*Haywood v. Gregg*, M.R., 24 W. R. 157.)

In this case a mortgagee entitled to mortgages created by two deeds, the first of which contained a covenant not to take proceedings to recover the mortgage-money without six months' notice, and the second was a mere deed of further charge, filed a bill for foreclosure of both mortgages, without giving any notice. Passing by the question whether a foreclosure suit is a proceeding for the recovery of the mortgage-money—a point on which there is a conflict of authority, the Master of the Rolls held that, as the plaintiff could file a bill to foreclose the second mortgage, and as the deed creating it contained the usual provision that the premises should not be redeemed or redeemable but upon payment by the mortgagor as well of the further charge as of the sum secured by the principal mortgage, the plaintiff was in substance entitled to the relief he sought, although in form his bill ought to have asked for foreclosure in respect of the further charge alone.

The decision is one that should be borne in mind by all conveyancers, showing as it does how easily the rights of mortgagees may be varied by an ill-considered use of an ordinary precedent. A covenant such as that in the recent case is not very common, but it is by no means unusual to have a proviso that the mortgage-money shall not be called in for a fixed period. In ordinary understanding a further advance becomes blended with the original debt, but this decision shows that this is not the view that the courts will necessarily take, and that there is a danger lest in fact the result may be that the principal debt becomes a kind of adjunct to the further advance. In the case suggested, where a loan for (say) five years, is followed, three months afterwards, by a further advance with the usual provision for, in effect, blending the debts, the mortgagee may be able to obtain payment of both the sums lent within a year from the date of the first loan.

Reviews.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

THE LAW AND PRACTICE OF FRIENDLY SOCIETIES AND TRADES UNIONS. By HENRY F. A. DAVIS, Solicitor. H. Sweet.

Mr. Davis tells us in his preface that his work is "rather the result of the author's interest in the subject, than of any desire on his part to make a book." The result is a very useful treatise. The volume contains rather more general dissertation, and also more particularity of detail, than is usual with law books, but this portion of the matter has not been allowed to swamp or obscure the purely legal portion, and this being so, we gladly welcome the admixture.

After a short historical sketch, our author treats his two subjects in order by way of chapters and sections. These chapters will be found to contain an abstract of the decisions up to the very latest date (for this we can vouch), interspersed with criticisms of the decisions themselves, and comments as to their particular application. As a specimen of legal writing, this part of the work is much above the average. The faults we have to find are on matters of detail. We do not see the necessity of giving more than the merest reference to obsolete cases. In one instance we have the effect of *R. v. Hastie*, which turned upon the repealed 7 & 8 Geo. 4, c. 29, s. 47 (replaced by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96, s. 68), given at length in a note to that part of the text (p. 104) which treats of embezzlement by a clerk or servant. And at p. 96 we read, with reference to the section of the Friendly Societies Act, 1875 (38 & 39 Vict. c. 60, s. 15, sub-section 7), which provides for the recovery of the property of the society from a bankrupt trustee, that "it has been decided that the corresponding sections of the old Acts were confined to persons duly and formally appointed officers of the society" (*Ex parte Oxford*, 21 L. J. Bkcy. 31). This is rather loose. What old Acts? A somewhat similar instance of inaccuracy occurs at p. 144. However, as we have said, the case law is, on the whole, very intelligently treated.

With the statutes, Mr. Davis has not been so happy. We have, indeed, at p. 17, a neat "summary of the new Act," which is, in the author's opinion, "well drawn," and is likely to cause "an immense reform in the management and procedure of friendly societies;" but we have failed to discover a detailed statement as to what sections are a re-production of the old law, and what sections are entirely new. And it would have been useful, and quite within the scope of Mr. Davis's work, to have informed us how many of the forty-six recommendations of the Royal Commission failed to pass into law. The history of the parliamentary discussion as to insurance of infants' lives is, we may remark, given at length. Returning to our author's treatment of the statutes, we have to complain that in far too many cases we are treated to sections at length (e.g., pp. 14, 49), without any variation of type. The appendix contains many valuable "forms of rules" for friendly societies, and a print (with useful references to the body of the work) of the Friendly Societies Act of 1875, but not of the Conspiracy Act, 1875. This latter Act is given piecemeal in the text. The index appears to be rather meagre, and we greatly miss the old-fashioned "Table of Cases," which Mr. Davis has deliberately excluded. The bulky official forms (pp. 9, 54), under the Friendly Societies, with which the work opens, ought, surely, to have been printed at the end of it. These, however, are all minor defects. Of the work, as a whole, we have formed a very favourable opinion.

It is stated that the town clerkship of Middlesborough is likely to become vacant by the resignation of Mr. John Thomas Beek.

Notes.

ON MONDAY, March 20, the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy, in a case of *Ex parte Nicholson*, decided a question of considerable importance with regard to the power given to the Court of Bankruptcy, by section 16 of the Debtors Act, 1869, to order a debtor to be prosecuted for offences mentioned in the Act, if it appear to the court that there is a reasonable probability of his being convicted. In *Ex parte Leonard* (23 W. R. 253, L. R. 19 Eq. 269) the Chief Judge held that the report of the trustee, or the representation of creditors, upon which the court is to act, must be made in writing, filed with the proceedings, and supported by proper evidence. In *Ex parte Nicholson* it was held that the report of the trustee was in itself sufficient, without any further evidence, to justify the court in making an order for prosecution. The Chief Judge said that there might be cases in which evidence besides the report would be requisite, but this could not be laid down as a universal rule. The report of the trustee might of itself establish a sufficient *prima facie* case. Moreover, it was not necessary that any notice should be given to the debtor of the intention to apply for an order to prosecute him. He was not entitled to be heard in opposition to the application. The question whether he was guilty or not had not then to be decided, and he would have every proper opportunity of defending himself afterwards. All that was required was to satisfy the court that there was a *prima facie* case.

ANOTHER POINT IN *Ex parte Nicholson* was this:—The order directing the prosecution was made by the registrar of a county court acting as judge under a delegated authority. The order was afterwards, on the application of the debtor, rescinded by the judge himself. The Chief Judge was of opinion that section 71 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, which empowers every court having jurisdiction in bankruptcy to review, rescind, or vary any order made by it, did not authorize the judge to rescind an order made by the registrar as judge. This, he said, would be in effect to allow an appeal from the registrar as judge to the judge, whereas section 71 provides that appeals from orders made by a county court are to be brought to the Chief Judge.

ON THURSDAY, March 23, in a case of *Ex parte Page*, the Court of Appeal acted upon the wholesome principle which was laid down in *Ex parte Cowen* (15 W. R. 859, L. R. 2 Ch. 563), viz., that, where the majority of creditors are seeking to use their statutory power to compel the minority to accept a composition in satisfaction of their debt, they must be acting *bona fide* as a matter of bargain with the debtor in the interest of the creditors, and not from mere motives of kindness to the debtor. If the facts are such as necessarily to lead to the inference that the majority have been actuated by the latter class of motives, the resolutions, though passed by the proper statutory majority, cannot bind the minority, and ought not to be registered. We notice the case because it is, as we believe, the first case in the Court of Appeal in which the registration of resolutions duly passed has been refused simply on this ground since the passing of the Act of 1869, and also because the decision appears to us to some extent to conflict with that of the Chief Judge in *Ex parte Elworthy* (23 W. R. 790, L. R. 20 Eq. 742). *Ex parte Cobb* (21 W. R. 777, L. R. 8 Ch. 727), was a case of actual fraud, a creditor having received a bribe to vote in the interest of the debtor. In *Ex parte Page* the debtor's statement showed that his debts amounted to £1,257, and that his assets were worth £371. The majority of the creditors resolved to accept a composition of 1s. in the pound, payable in twelve months, no security being given for its payment. The Court of Appeal (James and Mellish, L.J., and Baggey, J.A.) agreed with the registrar in thinking that under the circumstances the composition was a mere sham, and could not bind a dissentient creditor. The registration of the resolutions was therefore refused.

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

The question before the meeting of this society held at the Law Institution last Tuesday evening (Mr. A. M. Ellis, president) was "A railway company, upon the purchase of land, covenant not to build upon it above a certain height. The covenant comes to interfere with an extension of the works of the company under the powers of their Act which would be for the public advantage. Can the landowner obtain an injunction against the breach of the covenant?" Mr. Radford was appointed to open the question in the affirmative, and Mr. C. Russell James replied. In the debate that ensued six members supported the affirmative and seven argued for the negative. The chairman having summed up, the question was decided in the affirmative by a majority of one. Thirty members were present.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held on Wednesday last Francis T. Bircham, Esq., in the chair, the subject for debate being:—"That the principle of Mr. Norwood's Bill, which would enable barristers to recover their fees and render them liable for negligence, is worthy of support." A considerable number of gentlemen took part in the debate, the majority of whom were in favour of the motion. The chairman declined making a speech, as he considered the subject sufficiently exhausted, and, on putting the motion to the vote, it was carried by a majority of ten.

LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

The annual meeting was held on Thursday last at the offices, 126, Chancery-lane, W.C., James Cuddon, Esq., the chairman, presiding.

Mr. F. McGEE (actuary and secretary) read the notice convening the meeting, and the minutes of the preceding annual meeting.

The directors' report was as follows:—

"In the fire department, during the twelve months ending the 30th of November last, 5,497 proposals were made for insuring £5,340,348; and 5,168 policies and guarantees insuring £4,974,307, yielding new premiums to the amount of £7,541 10s. 9d., were completed, being an increase of £34,391 in sums insured, and a decrease of £114 12s. in premiums, as compared with the new business of last year.

"In the life department, during the same period, 358 proposals were made for insuring £349,375, and 285 policies were completed, insuring £266,730, and yielding new premiums to the amount of £9,150 16s. 2d. of which £1,333 2s. were single premiums, showing an increase of £59,270 in sums assured, and £1,028 9s. 2d. in premiums over the new business of last year.

"Ten annuities were granted, the purchase-money for which amounted to £2,431 1s. 11d.

"The total number of life policies in force on the 30th of November last (exclusive of annuity policies) was 2,906, insuring the sum of £2,104,754.

"The gross income of the company (exclusive of the sums received for annuities), for the year ending the 30th of November last, amounted to £118,455 5s. 6d., which, added to the sum received for granting annuities, makes a total receipt of £120,386 7s. 5d.

"The average rate of interest obtained on the invested assets of the company, during the past year, was £4 10s. 11d. per cent.

"The profit for the year in the fire department is £11,569 11s. 4d., four-fifths of which, namely, £9,255 13s., have been carried to the credit of the profit and loss account; and the remaining one-fifth, namely, £2,313 18s. 4d., has been added to the fire insurance fund, which amounts to £17,085 14s. 11d.

"On reference to the profit and loss account, it will be seen that the balance at credit thereof on the 30th of November last was £22,188 11s. 7d. Out of that sum the directors recommend the payment of a dividend of fifteen per cent. for the current financial year, which will amount to £9,000."

The CHAIRMAN said—Gentlemen, there can, I imagine, be

but one opinion respecting the accounts now before you—namely, that the result is most satisfactory. We have begun the current quinquennium with an aggregate amount of new premiums, in both departments, exceeding by about £1,500 the yearly average of the last quinquennium. The claims also in the past year have fortunately been much less than the ordinary expectation. We cannot, however, reasonably hope for perpetual sunshine; hence we deem it prudent to make a provision for some rainy day. You are aware that we have adopted the practice of equalizing, as far as possible, the dividend payable during each quinquennium, by retaining in very prosperous years something to make up for the falling off of less prosperous years. That policy we propose to continue, deeming an increase of dividend beyond £15 per cent. inexpedient until there is a moral certainty of such increase being permanently maintained. The directors are convinced that the true interests of the shareholders would thus be best consulted. I am persuaded that the satisfaction arising from a present merely temporary advance would be more than counterbalanced by the disappointment which would follow on a subsequent reduction. A very sound, safe, and comfortable state of things now exists. We have money in hand, on the profit and loss account, which, with the interest of the shareholders' capital, will suffice to provide a dividend of £15 per cent. for three years, including this current year (with a margin of several thousands to spare), thus leaving the profits, whatever they may be, of such three years untouched, and therefore available for future arrangements. This plan ought surely to give confidence to all persons interested in the company. During the past year we have established forty-three new agencies, from which good results are hoped for. We continue to exercise a strict economy in the management of the company, and look well to the safety of the investments. Permit me to impress upon you the necessity for continued efforts to promote the business of the company. The competition for insurance business is, as you are aware, daily increasing. Although the aggregate amount of new premiums in both departments is about £16,000 a year, it should not be forgotten that there must of necessity yearly arise many lapses, so that increase beyond lapses is the true test of the actual progress made in any year. I do not think I can usefully occupy your time by making any further observations. If any gentlemen should have any question to put to me before I propose the adoption of the report I shall be glad to give every information in my power. The chairman then moved the adoption of the report and accounts.

Mr. C. PEMBERTON (deputy-chairman) seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously without discussion.

Mr. GEORGE HYDE—I beg to propose "That the recommendation of the directors in their report now read, as to the payment of a dividend and bonus, be adopted, and that a dividend and bonus together, after the rate of fifteen per cent. per annum, free of income-tax, be paid to the shareholders on the paid-up capital for the financial year ending the 30th of November, 1876." I have very much pleasure in moving this resolution.

Mr. R. WARD seconded the motion, which was at once agreed to.

Mr. E. J. MILLIKEN proposed, and Mr. R. WARD seconded, the re-election of the retiring directors.

The names were put separately to the meeting, and in each case the re-election was carried with unanimity.

Mr. R. W. ROBERTS moved that Mr. Theodore Waterhouse be re-elected the shareholders' auditor for the ensuing year.

Mr. HYDE seconded the motion, and it was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN—I beg to propose the re-election of Mr. Darley as the directors' auditor for the ensuing year.

Mr. F. R. WARD seconded the resolution, and it was also unanimously agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTS proposed that the sum of fifty guineas be paid to each of the auditors for their services during the past year. He thought this sum was not at all excessive for the duties the auditors had to perform.

The motion was seconded by Mr. MILLIKEN, and agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN—I beg to propose a vote of thanks to the secretary, the solicitor, and the whole staff of the office. I am sure that the prosperity of the company is very greatly

enhanced by the assiduity, care, and attention which every one in this office pays to the affairs of the company.

Mr. PEMBERTON—I have very great pleasure in seconding that motion, as I can bear testimony to all that the chairman has said.

The resolution was cordially assented to.

Mr. MCGEDY—Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, on my own behalf and on behalf of the staff I thank you very sincerely for the vote you have been good enough to pass. The past year, as the chairman has told you, has been a very prosperous one, and the kind recognition you have given of our services will stimulate us to renewed exertions in the ensuing year. But, if, unhappily, this year should not prove so prosperous as the last, I hope you will not consider it due to any want of effort on our part.

Mr. GEORGE BURGESS (the solicitor) also acknowledged the compliment.

Mr. PEMBERTON—Gentlemen, before we part I will ask you to join me in a vote of thanks to our excellent chairman. To his great knowledge of insurance business, together with his constant attention to this office, the success of the company may in a great measure be attributed. He is assisted no doubt by a most able and zealous staff, but I feel sure that without him our dividends would not be what they are now.

Mr. ROBERTS—I have much pleasure in seconding that motion. I am sure we are greatly indebted to the chairman for all his exertions on behalf of this office. He has contributed in no small degree to its present success, and I hope he may long continue to give us the benefit of his advice and assistance. The resolution having been carried,

The CHAIRMAN said—I am exceedingly obliged to you for your kind vote of thanks, but I have been spoken of too highly. ("No.") I have simply contributed towards the prosperity of the office, and in a very much less degree than many of you may imagine. I thank you very much for your kind vote of thanks, and beg to assure you that it will be my constant endeavour to do all I can to promote the prosperity of the company.

The meeting then separated.

Appointments, &c.

Mr. BENJAMIN ADAM, solicitor, of Oakham, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Rutlandshire (Mr. Edward Frewen) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the present year. Mr. Adam was admitted a solicitor in 1834, and is clerk of the peace for Rutlandshire, county treasurer, and clerk to the magistrates for the county.

Mr. CHARLES FRANCIS EGERTON ALLEN, barrister, has been appointed Lecturer in English Law at the Bengal Presidency College. Mr. Allen was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated as a senior optime in 1870. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1871, and was formerly on the Northern Circuit. He has been for some time in practice at Calcutta.

Mr. GRINHAM KEEN, solicitor, of 24, Knight Rider-street, Doctors'-commons, E.C., has been appointed by the High Court of Judicature at Fort William, Bengal, a Commissioner to take Affidavits in all Suits, Matters, or Proceedings pending or about to be instituted in the said High Court of Judicature; also to take the Acknowledgments of Married Women to any Deeds in respect of Property in India. Mr. Keen has also been appointed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras a Commissioner for the like purposes.

Mr. FREDERICK KENT, of 8, Red Lion-court, Cannon-street, has been unanimously elected Solicitor to the Municipal Bank.

Mr. EDMUND PALMER NORTON, solicitor, of Bungay, has been elected Clerk to the Bungay School Board, in the place of Mr. William Thomas Hartcup, resigned. Mr. Norton was admitted a solicitor in 1857.

Mr. ODDEN FREDERICK READ, solicitor, of Thetford, has been elected Coroner for the Borough of Thetford, in the place of his late father, Mr. James Read, of Mildenhall. Mr. Read was admitted a solicitor in 1870, and had pro-

viciously been his father's deputy. He is also clerk to the borough magistrates and the Commissioners of Land and Income Tax, and to the Thetford Burial Board and School Board.

Mr. SINCLAIR TRAILL, solicitor, of Blandford, has been elected Clerk to the Blandford Local Board of Health, in the place of Mr. William Cole Fincham, resigned. Mr. Traill was admitted a solicitor in 1859, and is in partnership with Mr. Francis Tregonwell Johns, who is registrar of the county court and Under-Sheriff of Dorsetshire.

Mr. EDWARD W. WOODS, solicitor, of 3, Academy-street, Warrington, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Married Women for the Counties of Lancashire and Cheshire.

General Correspondence.

COUNTY COURT COSTS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—In the construction put by some registrars on the "scale of costs to be paid to solicitors in actions under £20" at the foot of the newly-issued consolidated orders, solicitors are being hardly used.

Allow me to take, for illustration, the second division of this scale, which applies to "actions where the amount recovered exceeds £5 and does not exceed £10." I contend that the words "For a default summons, instead of item 2" ought to be read "in addition to," and that I may charge thus:—

	£	s.	d.
(1) Lett r before action	0	3	4
(4) Preparing affidavit, &c.	0	6	0
(2) Instructions for and preparing particulars and entering plaint	0	6	8

for all this work has to be done. But the registrars I refer to, in default cases read the words "instead of" literally, and only allow the 3s. 4d. and the 6s., by which it comes about that I am allowed less than if I had issued an ordinary summons, when I should have been allowed 3s. 4d. and 6s. 8d. In fact, for the extra work of "preparing affidavit, &c.," instead of being paid, I am fined 8d.!

Nothing on the above as yet having appeared in your columns it will be an assistance to solicitors if some of your readers will publish some experience of the practice in the metropolitan and other county courts.

Again, what does the "note" at the foot of this scale mean? May we charge "in the summons" the item "attending or acting in court"? If so, my experience has been unfortunate in this matter also, the registrars not unnaturally thinking a case may be admitted or otherwise settled so as not to go into court at all, and so refusing to add that item to the costs in the summons. A SOLICITOR.

March 18.

[Upon both points one of the most experienced of the metropolitan registrars holds with the country registrars referred to by our correspondent.—ED. S. J.]

RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT, FEBRUARY, 1876.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I have been in the habit of entering the subsequent rules in their places amongst the rules in the schedule to the Act of 1875, as indicated in the margin of the later rules. I find that now there are two rules "4a" under ord. 61—one made in December, and the other last month. And r. 10 of the February rules is margined as "ord. 61, r. 10," whereas there is neither a r. 8 nor r. 9 to that order.

Would it not perhaps be more convenient for all parties concerned if a little more care were taken in the preparation of the rules in future? F. P. H.

It is said that the Earl of Radnor is about to resign the chairmanship of the Wiltshire Quarter Sessions.

Mr. Patrick M. Leonard, judge of county courts for circuit No. 51, has accepted the post of president of the Southampton Law Debating Society.

Courts.

THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.*

Oct. 25, 26; Nov. 1, 2, 3, 24; Jan. 8.—*The London and North-Western Railway v. The Guardians of the Poor of the Wigan Union.*

Poor rate—Railway—Stations—Sidings—Trade profits—Pairs of stock—Owners' wagons.

On appeal against the amount at which a railway and its stations were assessed to the poor rate:

Held, (1) as to the stations, that in ascertaining how much of the adjacent land occupied by the railway company formed part of the stations, and an element of their rateable value as distinguished from the line itself, all sidings, for whatever purpose used, should be included, and only the average quantity of the land required for the main tracks, and only the permanent way necessary to such tracks at any point in their length, should be excluded:

(2) The railway company made and repaired their own rolling stock, and claimed to deduct trade profits on such repairs. Held, that they were not entitled to any profits in respect thereof:

(3) The railway company in conducting a portion of their traffic used the wagon stock of private owners and of other railway companies. They carried to the account of their gross receipts the amount earned by means of such wagons, but the value of the wagons did not appear in the tenants' capital of rolling stock, and, therefore, no profits thereon were allowed as a deduction under that head. The company claimed, however, under a separate head a deduction of ten per cent. upon the value of these wagons upon the ground that it represented the amount of trade done in them by the company upon which the profits should be deducted. Held, that the profits should be deducted, but, as it appeared that the number of train miles run by owners' wagons was much less than the number run by those of other companies, five per cent. would be allowed upon the former, and ten per cent. upon the latter:

(4) The value of fixed machinery permanently attached to the freehold is landlord's property and rateable, and should not be deducted as part of tenants' plant or capital:

(5) Seventeen per cent. upon tenants' capital allowed (under the circumstances) for profit, interest, insurance, and deterioration, ten per cent. upon the capital invested in stores, five per cent. upon floating capital (in this case fixed at £300,000), and £50 per lineal mile allowed to be deducted for the landlord's expenses in maintaining the premises in a state to command the same rent:

This was a reference under section 9 of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1873 (36 & 37 Vict. c. 48), which enables the Railway Commissioners to decide any difference to which a railway company is a party on application of the parties to the difference. The matter referred was an appeal against a poor rate made upon the London and North-Western Railway. The appellants were the railway company, and the appeal was against the valuation list of the assessment committee of the Wigan Union in Lancashire.

It was agreed between the parties that the property of the railway company in the whole of the townships in the Wigan Union, except stations and buildings separately rated, should be deemed, for the purpose of the case, to constitute one tenement, and be treated as if situated within one parish; the parties having agreed to apportion such net annual value as should be found by the court for such tenement among the respective townships and parishes, deducting in each township or parish the amount of the local rates according to the amount in the pound. The value of the rolling stock and plant, and the fixed machinery, and the number of train miles run in the union in 1874, and the gross receipts, and the greater part of the expenses in that year were also agreed upon.

Hardinge Giffard, Q.C., Staveley Hill, Q.C., and R. E. Webster, appeared for the appellants.

Sir J. Holker, S.G., Edwards, Q.C., and Leresche, for the respondents.

Giffard, Q.C., for the appellants.—The parties have simplified the problem to be solved by agreeing to treat a variety of lines of railway and townships as if they were one undertaking running through one township. The substance of the controversy arose in respect of certain deductions. An increase in the actual receipts, which appeared to have induced the overseers in various parts of the country to

* Reported by W. H. MACNAMARA, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

increase the assessment, was no proper guarantee that the assessment ought to be increased. The working expenses had increased in a far greater proportion than the actual receipts. The railway company should be allowed trade profits in respect of the making and repairing of their own stock. They carried on the business of manufacturers and repairers of railway stock, and were therefore entitled to treat it as if it were the business in respect of which they were before the court, and to take the ordinary deductions in respect of trade profits. They claimed a deduction for proportion of wagon stock of private owners, and ten per cent. profit thereon. It was admitted that such stock was necessary to obtain the gross receipts, and that if such stock was not found by private owners the company would have to provide additional wagon stock of equal value. They claimed twenty per cent. upon tenants' capital for profits, and five per cent. upon floating capital. Those sums were allowed by the court in the *Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company v. Caistor Union*, 19 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL 180. With reference to the stations, the amount of profit the buildings ought to yield and the quantity of land to be included in the stations were disputed. In addition to the main line there was a loop or alternative line. The assessment committee said it was siding accommodation, and rateable as such. It was simply used as an alternative line to prevent the main line being blocked.

Sir J. Holker, S.G., for the respondents.—As the law stands the way to deal with the question of rating railways was to ascertain what sum a person would give for the concern supposing he was to become a tenant of it from year to year. He was not to become a permanent tenant of it. No doubt it was worth the while of the railway company to expend out of revenue a considerable amount of money for the purpose, not only of keeping the permanent way in good condition, but of adopting new improvements and contrivances for the purpose, in fact, of making the line permanently better than it was before. The North-Western Company had laid down a great number of steel rails in place of iron ones upon chairs of much greater size and heavier weight than the old chairs, and had expended a large sum in placing the block system of telegraphs upon their railway. Those permanent improvements had been paid for out of revenue, and the company claimed to deduct them under working expenses. It was not an expenditure that a tenant from year to year, whose tenancy might expire by proper notice at the end of any year would have incurred. It was unfair to base the working expenses upon the expenditure of 1874. They were exceptionally high in that year, owing to the dearth of coal and iron; it would have been fairer to have taken several years in order to strike an average. The allowance of ten per cent. for the profit on the repair of carriages should not be allowed. It assumed that the hypothetical tenant had no appliances for repairing stock. Why should not the hypothetical tenant be a railway company himself? The claim for proportion of wagon stock of private owners was an item which could not be justified. A tenant had to pay nothing, either for providing these wagons, or dealing with them in any way whatever, and if he had to do anything he was remunerated by the rate he got. If that item was allowed he would get the amount twice over. The coal carried in those very wagons was part of the gross receipts, by ascertaining which he got the total value of his stock, and upon that total value he claimed the twenty per cent. It had been decided in a great number of cases that the stations were to be valued and assessed separately from the line of railway; but the question of how much land ought to be valued as stations had never been the subject of judicial decision. Not only the structure of the station itself must be considered as station, but the platform and the sidings and turn-tables, which were used for the accommodation of the traffic. The railway, for the purposes of its traffic, required a certain space of ground on which to put sidings, and it put sidings on that piece of ground at a given expenditure. That property covered with sidings was in the parish.

Evidence of surveyors and others was given on both sides.

The Court, having taken time to consider, delivered the following judgment:—

This is an application by the London and North-Western Railway Company against the sums at which they have been

assessed in the valuation lists of the Wigan Union. They are the occupiers of eleven stations and thirty-two miles of railway in the union, and the matter referred for our decision is to find the entire rateable value of this property, inclusive of rates, the railway company and the union being agreed upon the manner in which the whole value when found shall be apportioned amongst the several parishes of which the union consists.

To find the annual value of the stations—which are the part of the property we will take first—it is necessary to determine, not only the mode in which the land in occupation, and the offices, sheds, platforms, sidings, and other appendages of a station, shall be valued, but also carefully to exclude the lines of railway in a station which are separately assessed. In the case before us the mode of rating has been to take a per-centage upon the present value of the stations, and the evidence did not show that land or structures had been over-valued. As to the other matter of what a station includes, the parties differ upon the point whether all the sidings or only some of them are part of the station and elements of its rateable value. The view of the respondents is, that the number of lines outside a station should regulate the number inside that could be excluded in rating the station, while the railway company, the appellants, contend for the exclusion, in addition, of all lines not in ordinary use either as standing room for wagons and carriages, or as sidings for loading and unloading goods, on the ground that, if there are more lines in a station than are appropriated to such purposes, they are lines laid down to facilitate the passage of traffic, and existing under the same conditions as the main tracks on which the through traffic runs, and they say that such lines and the space they occupy are taken into account in the separate rating of the railway, and that to rate them as also belonging to a station would be to rate them twice. In this, however, we do not agree, because the use and maintenance of stations and sidings being indispensable to a railway carrier's business, they become a cost of carriage, for which a deduction is allowed off the receipts from traffic, just as deductions are allowed to meet any other expenses of transit. And this remark shows that the question as to sidings is of importance to the parishes through which a railway passes as between one another, but is unimportant to the company occupying such railway. Every deduction from the gross receipts in a parish goes to diminish the rateable value of the parochial portion of railway, and a parish, therefore, is interested in the amount deducted by way of a contribution to the total station assessment, particularly if it is a parish in which no station happens to be situated. The railway company will not be rated beyond the rateable value of the whole property, stations and line, taken together, but from the point of view of the parish it is requisite to see that a station does not include more than properly belongs to it, because the gain of one parish is necessarily the loss of another. It is true that one of the agreed points in this case is that the deduction for stations shall be 54 per cent. upon the gross receipts, but that would be a sufficient percentage, in our opinion, however the question as to sidings might be decided. Now that question does not turn, as the railway company argued it did, on the use that is made of the sidings. No siding or any other part of a station contributes otherwise than indirectly to the earnings of a railway, the gross earnings including receipts of every kind, and a siding which is used to give free passage to through traffic aids the receipts as effectually as one that is used for warehousing or for loading and unloading. The point to be kept in view is that a parish is entitled to benefit by the value of all the land occupied by the railway company, and if land is taken in parish A. wide enough for the up and down traffic in its ordinary working, and in parish B. of a width sufficient to give the same accommodation and other accommodation besides, parish B. will be unequally rated relatively to parish A. if the additional width counts for nothing in the valuation for poor's rate. The parish will get nothing extra from tolls because these are per mile and the mileage is the same whether there are relief or alternative lines in a parish or not, and we are of opinion, therefore, that, in assessing a station in the Wigan Union, only the average quantity of land required for the main tracks, and only the permanent way necessary to such tracks at any point in their length should be excluded.

The remainder of the questions in dispute relate to the rateable value of the line itself. The gross receipts and the number of train miles due to the union are agreed figures based upon the returns for 1874, and the railway company

claim that the working expenses shall be made out upon the same basis. To this the union reply that the working expenses of 1874 were exceptionally high owing to the dearth of coal and iron, and that it will be more fair to take the average working expenses in the four years 1871 to 1874. Now, the assessment is for the year 1874, and the valuation was made in the previous year. Owing to the appeal to the quarter sessions, the actual figures of 1874 now exist as data by which the estimate can be corrected, and from the stand-point of 1873 would appear to be safe figures for that purpose. It is, however, left to us to say, upon consideration of all the information we have received, what a yearly tenant, taking this part of the company's railway from the end of 1873, would reasonably have estimated his expenses at, and having examined the accounts for last year and checked them by the accounts to the present time, which show no diminution in the rate per cent. of the expenses as a whole, notwithstanding the decreased charges for coal and iron, we do not see that he could reasonably have anticipated that his working expenses would be less than they were for 1874, and we decide this question in favour of the appellants.

Taking, then, the figures of 1874, it is agreed that the expenses under the heads of locomotive power, and carriage and wagon repairs, to be allocated to the union, amounted together to £38,240, of which amount £15,135 was the cost price of wages and materials for repairs to engines and to carriages and wagons, and the railway company claim that to this latter sum should be added ten per cent. for trade profits on repairs. It appears to us that so far as the £38,240 is for such repairs as a tenant from year to year would make, ordinary repairs to stock in constant use, he is, in regard to the items of wages and materials included therein, in the same position that he is in as regards wages to the engine drivers, guards, and others concerned with the movement of stock, and that a deduction for profit on the expenses of the first kind could not be allowed any more than it could be for profits on the other kind of expenses, and that if, as alleged by the respondents, any part of the £38,240 is for repairs or maintenance, such as only an occupier like a railway company, tenant and landlord at one and the same time, would undertake, a point to which we will allude later, a claim to profit in respect of any such part would be still less allowable.

To arrive at the rent of a portion of railway through the medium of deductions from gross receipts, we have to deduct, not only the expenses incurred in earning them, but also the tenant's profit on his stock and capital. The value of the rolling stock in this case is another of the agreed figures, and amounts for the Wigan Union to £186,639. The rolling stock has been valued at its cost price, less only a depreciation of 12½ per cent. all round. The £186,639 is it appears inclusive of fixed machinery, which, however, so far as it is permanently attached to the freehold, is rateable property, and not tenant's plant, and the amount therefore must to that extent be reduced. If the value of machinery so attached is for the Wigan Union as much as £6,972 that will be the deduction if less the proportion whatever it may be. The sum thus corrected being the amount of tenant's capital, exclusive of stores and floating capital, the next question is what per-centage shall be allowed him upon it for profit, the railway company claiming twenty per cent., and the respondents contending that ten per cent. will be quite sufficient, interest, profit, and deterioration included. Of the twenty per cent. in the company's claim, one-fourth is for deterioration, risk, and insurance, to cover any contingent loss of capital from those causes, and against this we think the union are entitled to a partial set-off in the circumstance that the expenses for locomotive power, and for carriage and wagon repairs paid out of revenue provide for additions and improvements to rolling stock, the gain from which will compensate the tenant for any loss from deterioration. We infer this from the fact that while the total charge to capital for working stock to December, 1874, is £6,929,862, the agreed value in 1874 exceeds nine millions. Another matter to be considered in fixing the per-centage has reference to the value put upon the rolling stock. That value is a high one compared with the amount at which the stock stands in the capital account, and high also in relation to the earnings of that stock in the Wigan Union, the coal receipts in private wagons forming a considerable part of the gross earnings. While, therefore, we shall allow the company fifteen per cent. for interest and profit, we think the further five per cent. claimed by the company should be reduced to two per cent., making seven-teen per cent. the total allowance.

The railway company use the wagon stock of private

owners, and the carriages and wagons of other railway companies in the conducting of some of their traffic, and as the rates and charges paid for the conveyance of that portion of traffic form part of the gross receipts credited to the union, they demand a deduction for profits of trade thereon, and estimate that ten per cent. upon the value of the stock would be a proper measure of the profits, as in the case of rolling stock of their own. But there is this difference, as it seems to us, between the two cases, that as regards, at any rate, the wagons of private owners the number of full train miles they run is much less in proportion than the number run by the company's own rolling stock, and we think five per cent. upon value as regards these wagons will give a sufficient sum for profits. We have not been able to make any similar comparison of work done in reference to the stock of other railway companies, and we shall therefore allow the ten per cent. claimed upon that item.

We also allow ten per cent. upon the capital locked up in stores, though perhaps a less per-centage would be enough if, as is probable, the stores as here valued included some which an occupying tenant who was not landlord as well would not require.

As regards a floating capital, we think, notwithstanding the contention to the contrary of the respondents, that it is necessary that a company should have in hand a working balance over and above traffic receipts, and that interest at five per cent. upon it is a fair deduction. The company estimate the floating capital requisite for their whole undertaking at considerably more than a million. They make their calculation by taking the accounts they have outstanding at the end of each half-year, less accounts they owe—also their cash at bankers' or at interest less value of special funds and less also money paid up on capital account but not yet expended, and, lastly, the interest and guaranteed dividends payable after each half-year, and these sums added together exceed a million, and show, they say, as well the amount of floating capital needed as the transactions in which it would be engaged. But if we look at rent as the return to the landlord on his outlay in creating or improving the hereditament to be rated, the amount a tenant would be prepared to give would be fixed quite independently of the manner in which share or debenture holders might divide it, and no expenses in distributing rent ought to have any place either as landlord's or tenant's deductions in finding rateable value. Still, without this, the company's account shows a large sum always outstanding—being the balance between what they owe and what is owing to them. But the truth is, the working capital of a tenant does not depend upon the state of a revenue account of assets and liabilities, but on the comparative amount of cash receipts and cash payments. Passenger receipts as a rule are cash receipts, and twenty per cent. of the charges for the carriage of goods is probably about the proportion paid on delivery, traders getting a credit of two or three months for the remainder. Now these ready-money payments would about meet the fifty-five per cent. of receipts absorbed by working expenses, or so much of the fifty-five per cent. as the company pay ready money for. On the other hand we must bear in mind that a railway business is not all concentrated in one place, and that the numerous places at which it is carried on require each a small reserve, also that the rent must in a case of guaranteed interests be paid as soon as it is due, and that the tenant of so great an undertaking ought to be prepared for sudden calls upon him to expend freely at once. We may assume that he would take the most economical course to meet such calls, which would be to borrow on the occasions of their happening, and, allowing for interest being charged continuously, we think it will be reasonable to fix the amount of the floating capital at £300,000.

Lastly, a deduction has to be made in respect of the landlord's expenses in maintaining his premises in a state to continue to command the same rent. The amount the railway company ask for to maintain their way and works and stations is £100 per lineal mile, and the answer of the union to this claim is that the sums already charged in the working expenses under the head of repairs to way and works are the expenses, not only of tenant's repairs, but of landlord's maintenance as well. We have no doubt that this is the case to a considerable extent, particularly as regards the line, the renewal of rails and sleepers being a yearly outgoing with which the revenue account is charged. We shall not, therefore, allow the whole of the company's claim, but we think one-half of it may be allowed.

Afterwards (on January 8, 1876), an application was made to the court, on behalf of the company, for leave to appeal, upon the ground that all sittings should not be included in the stations, or, if they should be, the company should be allowed to deduct a larger per-centage upon stations than 5½ per cent. But leave was refused, not only because it was a question of fact as to what was station or not, but also because the appellants had by their admissions in the case precluded themselves from raising the objection.

Solicitor for the appellants, *R. E. Roberts*.

Solicitors for the respondents, *Sharpe, Parkers, Fritchard, & Sharpe*.

COUNTY COURTS.

WAKEFIELD.

(Before Mr. Serjeant TINDAL ATKINSON, Judge.)

Jan. 18.—*Jackson & Others v. Roberts*.

Custom of London Corn Exchange.

HIS HONOUR, in giving judgment, said:—This is an action arising out of a claim for three days' interest upon the sum of £1,098 19s., namely, 9s. The amount is comparatively unimportant in itself, but the decision of the court is sought by the parties as a test whether, under the facts proved at the trial, the plaintiffs in a contract made in the grain market are entitled to recover the interest claimed. The facts in question are that on the 5th of July, 1875, a contract by bought and sold notes was made on the London Corn Exchange, by which the plaintiffs sold to the defendants a cargo of wheat consisting of 500 quarters, to be delivered at Goole, at 45s. a quarter, "net cash on receipt of bill of lading." The wheat was shipped at Maldon on the 13th of September. The invoice and the bill of lading were sent to the defendant by post on the 30th of September, but did not reach him until after business hours on the 1st of October. Not receiving a remittance, according to the terms of the contract, namely, "cash on receipt of the bill of lading," the plaintiffs telegraphed to the defendant pressing the amount to be forwarded at once, and apprising him that interest would be charged for the time elapsed since the payment became due. Upon this the defendant, on the 5th of October, remitted the principal sum, £1,098 19s., but refused to pay the interest on that amount for the three days claimed by the plaintiffs. Upon this state of facts I am called upon to say whether the plaintiffs are entitled to recover. The action is brought in this case simply for interest, and, in order to enable the plaintiffs to recover, they must prove either an express contract to pay interest or a promise to be implied from the usage of the trade, or other circumstances from which such a promise can be implied. The statute 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 42, s. 28, which allows interest on all debts or sums certain, payable at a certain time, or otherwise, and gives the jury at the trial of any issue or inquiry of damages the power to allow interest, has no application to the present case, that statute being limited to cases in which the debts, or sums, are payable by virtue of a written instrument at a certain time, or where a demand of interest on a debt has been made in writing: *Hartley v. Williams*, 4 Q. B. 219. At common law, when the contract is silent as to interest, it is presumed not to have been at the time of contracting within the contemplation of the parties, and hence could not be claimed: *Firth v. Leroux*, 2 T. R. 57; *De Haviland v. Bowerbank*, 1 Camp. 50; *Rhodes v. Rhodes*, 8 W. R. 204, 1 Joh. 653. There being no express promise to pay interest in this case, the plaintiffs, in order to recover, must prove an implied contract arising from the usage and dealings at this particular place where the dealing took place. It was contended for the defendant at the trial that, inasmuch as there was an express contract in this case, evidence could not be received to ingraft any terms into it or to explain its terms, but I was of opinion then, as now, that the objection is ill-founded. The law has long been settled that in commercial transactions extrinsic evidence of custom and usage is admissible to annex incidents to written contracts in matters with respect to which they are silent. The same rule has also been applied to contracts in other transactions of life, in which known usages have been established and prevailed; and this has been done upon the principle of presumption that in such transactions the parties did not mean to express in writing the whole of

the contract by which they are intended to be bound, but to contract with reference to those known usages: *Hutton v. Warren*, 1 M. & W. 474; and, therefore, a person who deals in a particular contract must be taken to deal according to the custom of that market: *Bayliffe v. Butterworth*, 1 Ex. 425. In the present case I am of opinion that the plaintiffs have succeeded in proving, as a fact, that in contracts of the kind in this action, made on the London Corn Exchange, there is a well-known and recognized rule by which interest becomes due from the purchaser in sales upon his default in not paying the price of the thing sold upon its delivery, or upon the receipt of a bill of lading. There will, therefore, in this case be a verdict for the plaintiffs."

E. Tindal Atkinson, for plaintiff.

Valentine Stapleton, for defendant.

Legal News.

In the Court of Arches, on Saturday last, Mr. Montague Cookson, Q.C., applied on the part of Mr. Sidney Gedge to appear as proctor in an ecclesiastical case.—Dr. Deane, Q.C., opposed on the part of the proctors.—Lord Penzance, after a lengthened discussion, decided that the application must be refused.

Mr. Alderman Nottage has written to the *Times*, with reference to the statement that Sir Alexander Cockburn is the first Chief Justice who has ever been presented with the freedom of the City of London, pointing out that Sir Charles Pratt (afterwards the first Earl Camden and Lord Chancellor) received the same compliment on the 21st of February, 1764, while holding the office of Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas. The occasion of the presentation was the wide popularity of the Chief Justice in consequence of his judgment discharging John Wilkes from custody, on the ground of parliamentary privilege, and his decision as to the illegality of general warrants. The corporation at the same time requested the Chief Justice to sit to Sir Joshua Reynolds for his portrait, which now hangs in the Upper Court at Guildhall.

The committee appointed by the Admiralty, the Board of Trade, and the Trinity House to consider the regulations for preventing collisions at sea have unanimously agreed to recommend certain amended draft regulations which they have reported in lieu of those now in force. The consent of other nations will, of course, be necessary. These amendments do not involve any serious alteration of the existing rules. The committee consider it of great importance that these rules which are now well understood should continue unaltered in substance; but there are some points in which they require elucidation, and there are other points on which their experience and the suggestions referred to them have shown that additions are necessary, and it is for these that they have endeavoured to provide. The principal amendments are the following:—Article 3, par. (a), provision is made for placing the white light of steamers, not only at the masthead, but at any proper place before the mast. This is rendered necessary by legal opinions as to the meaning of the present regulations. Article 5, which provides signals for ships laying telegraph cables, or otherwise not under command. Article 9, which removes doubts as to the lights to be carried by pilot vessels. Article 10, which provides signal lights for drift net fishers and trawlers, and puts an end to the conflict between the existing regulations and those annexed to the Sea Fisheries Act, 1868. Article 11, which makes it clearly lawful for overtaken vessels to show a light astern. This article is suggested in consequence of doubts as to the legality of so doing having been expressed in cases recently heard by the High Court of Admiralty and the Court of Appeal. Article 12, which, besides defining sound signals more distinctly and shortening the intervals at which they are to be made, requires a sailing ship in fog to denote her tack by her fog horn. Article 14, which is re-written so as to make the meaning more distinct. Article 15, in which, in order to meet the practice of other nations, words are added to make it clear that the English term "port helm" is equivalent to altering the course of the ship to starboard, and vice versa. Article 19, by which, following a practice

successfully adopted in the United States, steamers are enabled to indicate to an approaching ship the direction they are about to take. Article 21, which adopts the general statutory rule that existed before 1862 for steamships navigating narrow channels—viz., that each ship shall keep to the starboard side of the mid channel. Article 25, which reserves special and local rules lawfully made by harbour authorities. The remainder of the alterations are verbal merely.

Sir John Stuart writes to the *Times* with reference to the Appellate Bill:—"It seems to be forgotten that this project now before Parliament is substantially only a revival of a Bill introduced and wisely abandoned in 1856. It had been recommended by a committee of the House of Peers, but, after consideration and discussion, dropped by men whom, without offence, I may venture to call more able and more learned and more wise than any of those now concerned in reviving the exploded project. Let me invite attention to some of the views which led to the abandonment of that Bill. When duly considered they may probably cause the Bill now pending to be abandoned too. These views were the second and better thoughts of great men—of Lord St. Leonards, of Lord Lyndhurst, of Lord Brougham, of Lord Campbell, of the late Earl of Ellenborough, and other great statesmen and lawyers. What, after consideration and discussion, seemed the correct view was the following:—The appellate jurisdiction of the House of Peers is, by its constitution, exercised under the wise direction of the Lord High Chancellor for the time being. He is, or ought to be, the greatest and most wise lawyer of the day. He has the power of commanding and calling in the assistance, as assessors, of all or any of the greatest and best judges of the land—of the Lords Chief Justices, of the Master of the Rolls, of all or any of the equity judges, of all or any of the judges of England, Scotland, or Ireland, of Privy Councillors, and even of any layman. It would seem that no man of common sense capable of understanding the subject can doubt that such assistance (which can always be had in a due degree when cases require it) must give to the decisions of the House of Lords on appeals the highest possible respect and the greatest possible satisfaction to the public. Such is the present constitution of the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords, when properly exercised. Such is the admirable system which it is the object of the present Bill to destroy. The scheme to be substituted is to delegate the jurisdiction to inferior peers, who must be of inferior capacity to the judges from whom they are to hear appeals, and to the Lord High Chancellor whom they may overrule."

Mr. Justice Brett, in charging the grand jury at the Liverpool Assizes, alluded at length to a case, the first of its kind, which had arisen under a section of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1875. The section provides that, in case of an unseaworthy ship being sent to sea, the managing owner is liable to be charged with misdemeanour, and the *onus* is laid upon him of proving his innocence of any guilty knowledge. Mr. Justice Brett said the old law, if firmly administered, would have been amply sufficient to meet the case. A person who knowingly sent an unseaworthy ship to sea would have been guilty of manslaughter if the crew were lost. But under the statute passed in 1875 every person who sent an unseaworthy ship to sea was guilty of misdemeanour. If the word "knowingly" had been left in it would have been according to the ordinary principles of law, but it was left out. His lordship, after reading the section, went on to say it had been thought right to legislate in a manner contrary to all the received views of English criminal law, which had hitherto been so tender with regard to the person accused as to require the strictest proof of guilt. The burden of proof lay upon those who prosecuted, but here it was reversed, and the moment it was proved that the ship had gone to sea the managing owner was called upon to prove that he was innocent. Such a principle as this was now seen for the first time in the history of this country. For himself, he should shudder when he first saw the experiment tried—when he should see a man standing in the dock charged as a criminal, who should be sworn upon the book to give evidence, and who should be cross-examined by counsel as he stood in the dock. He had nothing more to say about it, because the Legislature had passed the statute; but he confessed that the first time he saw it it would make him shudder to think of the change

that had come over the administration of the criminal law of this country. He should be obliged to permit it, but he should do so with the greatest possible reluctance. The direction he had to give to the grand jury was this—if they found as a fact that the ship was unseaworthy, so as to be dangerous to life, and that the person charged was the managing owner, they had nothing to do, according to this law, but to find a bill upon which he would be charged with a criminal offence.

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

March 16.—IRISH JUDICATURE.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in introducing a Bill on this subject, explained that, as regarded all questions relating to the practice of the courts, the Bill was almost entirely the same as that of 1874. It provided in the case of the Irish courts the changes made by the English Judicature Act in the practice of the English courts. The procedure was assimilated also; and where the doctrine of the different courts was different it was assimilated. The second part dealt with the question of the officers of the various courts affected by the Bill. As to the common law courts, in the Queen's Bench he proposed to make no change. The Court of Common Pleas, like the other two common law courts, had until lately four judges, including the chief; but a vacancy occurred which had not been filled up by the appointment of a new judge, and now that court had only three judges—the chief and two puisne judges. He proposed to introduce in the Court of Common Pleas the judge of the Probate and Matrimonial Court, and not to otherwise fill up the vacancy in the Common Pleas. The jurisdiction of the Probate and Matrimonial Court would be transferred to the Court of Common Pleas, and the judge to be transferred would transact there routine and unopposed business of the Probate Court. He would also try probate cases in contentious cases, and would sit with the other judges of the Court of Common Pleas *in Banco*. The present probate judge would also, on his own consent, be competent to go circuit, but any successor to him would be obliged to go circuit as a part of his duty. As to the Exchequer, he proposed that when a vacancy occurred among the puisne judges that vacancy should not be filled up, but that powers should be taken which, in the event of certain changes being made hereafter in the Bankruptcy Court, would lead to the introduction of this latter court in the Exchequer Division. A great desire had sprung up in the cities of Belfast and Cork to have a local bankruptcy jurisdiction, and if Parliament should think fit to sanction such an arrangement hereafter that would very much reduce the bankruptcy business in Dublin. Consequently, power was taken in the Bill to transfer the bankruptcy business of the metropolis to the Exchequer Division, and to transfer to that court one of the bankruptcy judges, relieving from office the other judge, or, at all events, not replacing him. One provision of the Bill was that when a vacancy occurred in the Exchequer Division it was not to be filled up. With regard to the Admiralty judge he did not propose to interfere with him at present, but he proposed that no successor to him should be appointed, and that when a vacancy occurred in that office the admiralty business should be transferred to one of the divisions of the new Court. He proposed that the office of Receiver-Master should come to an end. His duties were to be handed over to the two judges of the Landed Estates Court. Passing to the Chancery Division it was proposed by the Bill that, with the exception of lunacy jurisdiction, the Lord Chancellor should be entirely an appellate judge. With regard to the two Landed Estates judges he proposed that they should both be judges of the Chancery Division, each retaining the jurisdiction of the Landed Estates Court, retaining a separate existence for that purpose and for the transaction of the duties now discharged by the Receiver-Master. The Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice would therefore consist of the Master of the Rolls, a Vice-Chancellor, and two Landed Estates judges. The Bill provided that when a vacancy occurred in the case of either of the judges of the Landed Estates Court it was not to be filled up till after a Royal commission was appointed to

inquire into the state of business in that court and the report of that commission had been received. With regard to the Court of Appeal he proposed that a new Judge of Appeal should be appointed, and that the court should consist of the Lord Chancellor, the present Lord Justice of Appeal, a new Lord Justice of Appeal, and the three Chiefs of the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions; the three chiefs to be *ex-officio* members of the court. Turning to the question of salaries, he proposed that hereafter the salaries should stand thus:—the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, £5,000; the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, £4,600; the Chief Baron of the Exchequer, £4,600; all the puisne judges, the Master of the Rolls, the Vice-Chancellor, and the future judges of the Landed Estates Court, £3,500 each, but with this qualification, that all the judges who go circuit should have a fixed and definite allowance for going circuit of £150 for each circuit, or £300 for the two circuits of each year. He proposed to consolidate the three taxing offices of chancery, common law, and Landed Estates Court into one taxing office; the Chancery Record and Writ Office with the Common Law Writ Office; the office of the Accountant-General in Chancery with that of the Landed Estates Court; and the Chancery Notice Office with the Notice Office of the Landed Estates Court; and to take powers for the abolition of unnecessary offices—those powers to be exercised by the Lord Chancellor and the three common law chiefs, or any two of them, of whom the Lord Chancellor must be one.

March 17.—CROSSED CHEQUES.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

COUNCIL OF INDIA (PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS).

The Marquis of SALISBURY, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said the object of the measure was to amend certain enactments in an Act of 1869, having reference to the appointment of persons with professional or other qualifications as members of this Council of India. To persons of Indian experience who were appointed on the Council of India a pension was secured by right of their services in India, and for that and other reasons no difficulty was found in getting persons with the qualification of Indian experience to accept the office of member of the Council for the annual salary of the office. But, though the majority of the Council was composed of such persons, it had been regarded as necessary to secure the services, as members, of persons possessing professional or other qualifications, but not being of Indian experience. As there was no pension attached to the office, it had been found difficult to get properly-qualified persons to accept the appointment. He meant men skilled in law or finance, or perhaps in some other walk. This Bill would enable the Secretary of State to appoint such persons with the right of pension on retirement; but a clause in the Bill limited the number of persons who might so be appointed, with the right of pension, to three.—The Bill was read a second time.

March 20.—TELEGRAPHS (MONEY).

This Bill was read a second time.

March 21.—PATENTS FOR INVENTIONS.

This Bill passed through committee after certain amendments had been introduced.

COUNCIL OF INDIA (PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS).

The House went into committee on this Bill.—The Marquis of SALISBURY moved an amendment in the Bill, the effect of which would be that the three councillors to be appointed under it would hold office "during good behaviour," as was the case with the councillors appointed under the Act of 1858.—The amendment was agreed to.

TELEGRAPHS (MONEY).

This Bill passed through committee, and was reported to the House.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

March 16.—ROYAL TITLES.

On the motion for going into committee on this Bill, the Marquis of HARTINGTON moved "That, while willing to consider a measure enabling her Majesty to make an addition to the Royal style and title which shall include such dominions of her Majesty as to her Majesty may seem meet, this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to impair the ancient and Royal dignity of the Crown by the assumption

of the style and title of Empress."—On a division the motion was rejected by 324 to 192, and the House went into committee, but progress was at once reported.

March 17.—COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER (CLERK OF THE PEACE).

This Bill was read a third time.

OPEN SPACES (METROPOLITAN DISTRICT).

The House went into committee on this Bill, but progress was at once reported.

FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Dr. WARD moved the second reading of this Bill, but on a division it was lost by 215 to 131.

HOUSE OCCUPIERS' DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL.

On the motion for the second reading of this Bill, Mr. DODDS moved that it be read a second time that day six months.—The debate stood adjourned.

SEA INSURANCES (STAMPING OF POLICIES).

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

CONSOLIDATED FUND.

This Bill was read a second time.

March 20.—ROYAL TITLES.

The House went into committee on this Bill.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON moved in clause 1, page 2, line 3, after "India," to insert "and in order to include her Majesty's colonial dominions in the Royal style and title of her Majesty," but the amendment was ultimately withdrawn.—Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN moved, in clause 1, line 5, after the word "India," the insertion of the words, "But not so as to give any style or title which her Majesty may be graciously pleased to assume any precedence or priority over the Royal style and title now appertaining to the imperial Crown.—This amendment also was withdrawn.—Mr. Serjeant SIMON moved the insertion of the word "Royal" in clause 1, so as to make it clear that the addition to be made by her Majesty should be an addition to the "Royal" style and title at present appertaining to the Crown, &c.—On a division the amendment was rejected by 171 to 92.—Mr. NEWDEGATE moved to insert in line 8 of the clause, after the words "seem meet," the words, "Provided always that nothing in this Act shall be held to impair or to invalidate the functions and authority of Parliament as at present exercised with respect to the Government of India."—The amendment was ultimately withdrawn.—Mr. PEASE moved the following proviso: "Provided that nothing in this Act contained shall be taken to authorize the use in the United Kingdom of any style or title of her Majesty other than those at present in use as appertaining to the imperial Crown," but this amendment also was withdrawn.—Sir W. HARCOURT moved in line 18 to leave out from "Government of" to "should become" in line 19, and insert "the territories in the possession of or under the government of the East India Company, and all rights vested in or which might have been exercised by the said company in relation to any territories."—The amendment was negatived, and the Bill was ordered to be reported.

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2).

This Bill passed through committee.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS.

This Bill was read a second time.

SEA INSURANCES (STAMPING OF POLICIES).

This Bill, as amended, passed through committee.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

March 24, 1876.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 9½	Annuities, April, '88, 9½
Disco for Account, April 1, 9½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1868
Do 3 per Cent. Reduced, 9½	Ex Bills, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 1 pm.
New 3 per Cent., 9½	Disco, £200, Do. 1 pm.
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Disco, £100 & £200, 1 pm.
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, — per
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '78	Ct. (last half-year), 257
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Disco for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80, 106½	Ditto, ½ per Cent., May, '79, 75
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '89, 103 xd	Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent. 5 April, '64
Ditto, ditto, Certificates —	Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. 73
Ditto Enfacad Ppr., 4 per Cent. 81	Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
2nd Inf. Fr., 8 per C., Jan. '73	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	137
Stock Caledonian	100	122½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	102
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	44
Stock Great Northern	100	132½
Stock Do., A Stock*	100	136
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock Great Western—Original	100	107½ xd
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	133½
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	114½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	124
Stock London and North-Western	100	143
Stock London and South-Western	100	121½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	70½
Stock Metropolitan	100	98½
Stock Do., District	100	45½
Stock Midland	100	133
Stock North British	100	101½
Stock North Eastern	100	156½
Stock North London	100	128
Stock North Staffordshire	100	68
Stock South Devon	100	69
Stock South-Eastern	100	124

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The Bank rate has been reduced from 4 to 3½ per cent., the proportion of reserve to liabilities having risen from 42 to 46½ per cent. In the foreign market the principal feature has been the panic in Egyptian stocks on the refusal by Mr. Dierrell to publish Mr. Cave's report, and the fall would have been even greater had there not been large purchases from Paris. The home railways have been very heavy, and although there is a recovery in most shares they still show a decline since last week. Consols close at 94½ for money and 94½ for account.

BIRTHS.

BYFIELD—March 18, at Tavistock House, Barnet, Herts, the wife of G. Dickinson Byfield, solicitor, of a son.
 DRUMMOND—March 20, at 3, Lyndhurst-road, Peckham, the wife of Patrick William Drummond, solicitor (formerly of Croydon), of a daughter.
 DYNE—March 20, at Coombe House, Hampstead-lane, Highgate, the wife of John Bradley Dyne, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
 FORD—March 20, at 164, Adelaide-road, N.W., the wife of Edward Ford, barrister-at-law, of a son.
 SOLOMON—March 19, at 2, Tavistock-road, Westbourne-park, the wife of Joseph Maurice Solomon, barrister-at-law, of a son.
 TREHEARNE—March 18, at Upper Richmond-road, Putney, the wife of A. T. Trehearne, solicitor, of a son.
 YOUNG—March 16, at 2, North Bailey, Durham, the wife of J. Griffith Young, solicitor, of a daughter.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, March 17, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Bog Mining Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before April 24, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William John Lovington, Auctioneers, Tuesday, May 2, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.
 British Guardian Life Assurance Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 11, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Saturday, March 25. Wynne, Cornhill, agent for Brabner and Court, Liverpool, solicitors for the petitioner.
 General Register and Meter Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before April 11, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to James Waddell, Mansion House Chambers, Queen Victoria st. Friday, April 28, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.
 Halifax Worsted Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated March 10, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Williamsons and Co, Sherborne lane, agents for Story, Halifax, solicitor for the petitioners.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Fourth Union Benefit Building Society.—Petition for winding up, presented March 13, directed to be heard before the V.C. at 6, St. James buildings, Lincoln's inn, on Tuesday, March 28. Evans and Lockett, Liverpool, solicitors for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, March 31, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

British Farmers' Pure Lined Cakes Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 20, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on March 31. Goldring, Southampton st, Bloomsbury square, solicitors for the petitioners.
 Grammes Magneto-Electric Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 15, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on Saturday, March 31. Rooks and Co, King st, Chesapeake, solicitors for the petitioner.
 Passenger General Register Company, Limited.—V.C. Bacon has, by an order dated Nov 15, appointed George Sneath, Gresham st, to be official liquidator.
 Probias Insurance Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 20, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on March 31. Argles and Rawlins, Gracechurch st, agents for Anderson and Argles, Paris, solicitors for the petitioner.
 Southsea Floral Hall and Aquarium Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 17, directed to be heard before the M.R. on April 1. Edwards, Foulty, solicitor for the company.
 United Bituminous Collieries Company, Limited.—V.C. Bacon has, by an order dated Nov 25, appointed Frederick Warwick, Buckingbury, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before April 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Tuesday, May 2, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, March 17, 1876.

Royal Standard Benefit Society, Northampton Arms, Northampton st, Cambridge rd. March 11

TUESDAY, March 31, 1876.

Benevolent Society, Dolphin Inn, Luncheon, Cornwall. March 16
 Free Trade Benefit Society, Rose and Crown, Tewin, Hertford. March 16

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, March 7, 1876.

Child, George Henry, Lincoln st, Chelsea, Dairyman. March 31.
 Morris v Child, V.C. Malins. Few Surrey st, Strand
 Donaldson, Thomas, late Earl of. March 31. Cockrane v Donaldson, V.C. Malins. Few and Co, Spouty st, Strand
 Flanders, Henry, Newgate st, Frier. April 11. Flanders v Stamp, V.C. Bacon. Boyer, Old Jewry chambers
 Freeman, Elizabeth, Harpenden, Hereford. March 31. Freeman v Speckman, V.C. Malins. Beal, Sessions House, Clerkenwell
 Hind, William, Narborough, Leicester, Gent. April 10. Hind v Robinson, V.C. Hall. Dalton and Salusbury, Leicester
 Hoyte, Jane, Chilwell, nr Nottingham. April 4. Hoyte v Hoyte, M.R. Aston, Nottingham
 Kerr, Benjamin. Crick, Northampton, Sergeant. April 4. London Orphan Asylum v Paterson, V.C. Hall. Cattlin, Guildhall yard
 Marston, Joseph, King square, St Luke's. April 10. Gilling v Nalson, V.C. Hall. Boulton, Northampton square, Clerkenwell
 Smith, James, Gateshead, Durham. April 1. Foster v Smith, V.C. Malins. Robson, Gateshead
 Todd, John, Howard rd, South Horseay, Stonemason. April 3.
 Todd v Atkinson, V.C. Bacon. Boulton and Sons, Northampton square

FRIDAY, March 10, 1876.

Benson, Robert, Craven hill gardens. Elsewhere than in the United Kingdom. July 1. Benson v Benson, M.R. Pews, Old Jewry chambers
 Griffin, Thomas, Birdenbury fields, Warwick, Farmer. April 13.
 Rice v Griffin, M.R. Hawtin, Banbury
 Kettlewell, Richard, Minskip, York, Gent. April 11. Dawson v Horner, V.C. Bacon. Paley, York
 King, Thomas, Hemingford rd, Islington, Cowkeeper. April 12.
 King v King, V.C. Hall. Howard and Co, New Bridge st
 Payne, Amey, Bristol. March 28. Payne v Meade-King, V.C. Malins.
 Adams, Whitefield Hale, Bristol, Gent. March 28. Payne v Meade-King, V.C. Malins. Adams, Lincoln's inn fields
 Philips, Thomas, Sydney terrace, Sydney rd, Homerton, Gent. April 6.
 Martin v Shearman, V.C. Malins. Groat, Suffolk lane, Cannon st

TUESDAY, March 14, 1876.

Child, Coles William John, Bromley, Kent, Esq. April 4. Child v Stahlchmidt, V.C. Malins. Latter, Bromley
 Garwood, Charles, Arundel, Sussex, Gent. April 5. Barnard v Hardwick, V.C. Malins. Hardwick, Littlehampton
 Hanson, John, Burton-on-Trent, Stafford, Wheelwright. April 17.
 Hanson v Hanson, M.R. Goodger, Burton-on-Trent
 Herschhorn, Maurice, Castle st, Importer of Artificial Flowers. April 6.
 Herschhorn v Herschhorn, V.C. Hall. Mason, Gresham st
 Smith, William Knight, South Mims, Middlesex, Farmer. April 12.
 Smith v Smith, V.C. Malins. Holland, Knight Elder st, Doctors' commons
 Stephens, George, Plymouth, Devon, Gent. April 7. Stephens v Stephens, M.R. Fridham, Plymouth
 Rawston, James, and Thomas Rawston, Alden, Lancashire, Cotton Spinners. April 8. Rawston v Rawston, V.C. Malins. Woodcock, Hastingdon
 Sampson, George, Great Cambridge st, Hackney rd, Timber Merchant. April 12. Shorrey v Sampson, M.R. Kindon, Lawrence lane, Chesapeake

FRIDAY, March 17, 1876.

Banks, William, Selby, York, Timber Merchant. April 15. Banks v Banks, M.R. Parker, Selby
 Boyd, Robert Parker, Wellington, Somerset, Esq. April 19. Holt v Digby, V.C. Hall. Robinson, Skipton

Galloway, Robert, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Smack Owner. April 20.
 Frost v Wooden, V.C. Hall. Rayson, Great Yarmouth
 Geo. Edward, Wisbeach Fen, Cambridge, Farmer. April 16. Laming
 v Smith, V.C. Hall. Thompsons and Co, Stamford
 Green, Joseph, Lowermoor, Worcester, Innkeeper. April 17. Green v
 Green, V.C. Bacon. Corbett, Worcester
 Hughes, Richard, Sgnaill Hall, Stafford, Esq. April 10. Davey
 v Ward, V.C. Malins. Hawksford, Wolverhampton
 Hunt, Samuel, Derby, Yeoman. April 21. Fletcher v
 Ridsdale, V.C. Hall. Wheatcroft, Belper
 Jenkins, John, Halifax, York, Gent. April 21. Wainman v Jenkin-
 son, District Registrar, Halifax. Barstow, Halifax
 Joyce, Samuel, Endsleigh st, Tavistock square, Esq. April 17. Joyce
 v Low, M.R. Baker and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 Monkhouse, John, Portobello rd, Notting hill, Grocer. April 20.
 Tomlin v Monkhouse, V.C. Hall. Snow, College hill, Cannon st
 Preston, Elizabeth, Richmond, Surrey. April 13. Preston v Preston,
 V.C. Malins
 Roberts, David William, Llanfairfechan, Carnarvon, Doctor of Medicine.
 April 11. Roberts v Hughes, M.R. Jones, Denbigh
 Strong, Richard, Southall-park, Middlesex. May 10. V.C. Malins
 Williams, Jane, Jun, Ruthin, Denbigh. April 13. Williams v Jones,
 M.R. Adams, Ruthin
 Winsor, James William, Croydon, Surrey, [Coroner. April 15.
 Wiggins v Gardner, V.C. Bacon. Meedham, New inn

TUESDAY, March 21, 1876.

Bowers, Robert Arnold, Remford, Essex, Surgeon. April 17. Burbrow
 v Chubb, M.R. Harvie New Broad st
 Brown, John, Bangor, Ireland, Ship Owner. April 13. Brown v
 Thompson, V.C. Malins. Patchard, St Michael's buildings, Cornhill
 King, William, Ha field Peverel, Essex, Farmer. April 17. Bott v
 Taylor, M.R. Thompson, Cornhill
 Payne, Whitefield Hele, Bristol, Gent. March 20. Payne v Meade-
 kin, V.C. Malins. Adams, Lincoln's inn fields
 Ponsford, John, Watling st, Woolen Warehouseman. April 15.
 London v Southall, V.C. Malins. Layton, Badge row
 Street, Donald, Gloucester terrace, Bacon's park. April 20.
 McLaren v Parkington, V.C. Hall. Campbell, Warwick st, Regent st
 Westropp, Sara Jane, Stoke N-wington. April 19. Hull v Hill, V.C. Hall.
 Faw and Co, Surrey st, Strand

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, March 14, 1876.

Andrew, Henry, Truro, Cornwall, Surgeon. April 20. Smith and
 Paul, Truro
 Paul, Emily, Hove, Brighton. April 8. Reeves, Essex st, Strand
 Brown, Samuel, Biosfield mews, Harrow rd, Cab Proprietor. April
 10. Apps, South square, Gray's inn
 Chapman, Rev John, Newport, Essex. May 27. Collin, Saffron
 Walden
 Chellingsworth, Annie Walwyn, Grendon Court, Hereford. May 1.
 Monckton and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 Coker, Joseph Edward, Lewman st, Goodman's fields, Cooper. May 1.
 Baideler and Sons, Lewman st, Goodman's fields
 Combs, William Addison, Ealing, Middlesex. Gent. April 10. Cut-
 tiffe, Jon, Cornhill
 Cabitt, Thomas, Wotton, Norfolk, Gent. May 1. Wilkinson, North
 Walsham
 Deiler, Benjamin, Slough, Buckingham, Gent. April 11. Phillips,
 Windsor
 East, Marianne Frances Clayton, Stanhope place, Hyde park. April
 25. Budd and Son, Bedford row
 East, Richard, Cherry Willingham, Lincoln. Gent. April 1. Williams,
 Lincoln
 Golding, Arthur, Elmwell, Suffolk, Farmer. April 30. Golding,
 Walsham-le-Witows
 Graham, Helen Anne Honora, Stranraer place, Maida vale. May 1.
 Woodroffe and Plaskitt, New square, Lincoln's inn
 Granley, Right Hon Fletcher Lord, Granley Hall, York. April 15.
 Pridemore, Lincoln's inn fields
 Grundy, Hannah, Eastwood, Nottingham. May 1. Fretson and Son,
 Bield
 Hignett, Margaret, Manchester. April 11. Potter and Lowe, Man-
 chester
 Highton, George William, Inverness terrace, Esq. June 24. Johnson
 and Co, Austin friars
 Jullien, Suzanne Pauline, Shipley, Arundel st, Coventry st.
 May 1. Chatterton, Ludgate hill
 Knowles, Edward, Bryn Hyfryd, Denbigh. May 6. Knowles, Liver-
 pool
 Lee, Daniel Green, Nottingham, Agent. April 30. Lees, Nottingham
 Lilley, Joseph, Trinity square, Newington, Esq. May 1. Under-
 wood, Chancery lane
 Morgan, Anne, Brisbane, Queensland. April 1. Saben, Stone
 Morris, William, Pall mall, Rear Admiral R.N. April 14. Carpenter,
 Regent st
 Oldfield, Edward, Bristol, Gent. April 22. Nunneley, Bristol
 Pass, Charles, Leeds, York, Joiner. May 1. Simpson and Burrell,
 Leeds
 Percy, Samuel, Manchester, Telegraph Agent. April 13. Hankinson,
 Manchester
 Pimblett, Henry Abel, Salford, Lancashire, Brick Maker. April 11.
 Potter and Lowe, Manchester
 Potter, Charles, Hackney rd, Bethnal green, Gent. April 24. Gepp
 and Sons, Chelmsford
 Rankin, Mungo Murdoch, Liverpool, Draper. Lynch and Teabay,
 Liverpool
 Rawstron, Thomas, Haslingden, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. April 5.
 Woodcock and Sons, Haslingden
 Roberts, Henriette Marie Felice, Paris. May 1. Newman and Co,
 Cornhill
 Rowlands, William, Marston, Stafford, Maltster. April 8. Liddle
 Newport, Salop
 Sargent, Sally Maria Sampson, Penge, Surrey. May 13. Finney,
 Chancery lane
 Shuttlewood, James, Stebbing, Essex, Farmer. April 15. Holmes, Bock-
 ing, Braintree

Spencer, Thomas, Marlborough rd, Chelsea, Butcher. April 20. Tur-
 ner, Bedford row
 Scott, Charles, Manchester, Gent. April 13. Hankinson, Manchester
 Trenchard, John Trenchard, Ranspole, Dorset, Esq. May 8. Hume
 and Co, Great James st, Bedford row
 Willis, Henry, Warren st, Flitway square, Civil Engineer. April 6.
 Lambert and Co, John st, Bedford row
 Witherington, Thomas, Worcester, Chemist. April 15. Jennings,
 Leadenhall st
 Yeates, George Henry Brettingham, Brettingham Holt, Westmorland. May
 1. Harrison and Son, Kendal

FRIDAY, March 17, 1876.

Bell, Thomas Brown, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. May 16. Hodge and
 Harle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Bissell, Ellen Mary, Reading, Berks. April 20. Thomas Overden, Free-
 masons' Railway Tavern, Ladywell, Lewisham
 Bold, Edward, Brighton, Sussex, Commander R.N. May 1. Cooper
 and Williams, Brighton
 Boorn, George, Siddle-ham, Sussex, Yeoman. April 29. Raper and
 Freeland, Chichester
 Brown, Edmund, Wellington st, Deptford, Corn Dealer. April 29.
 Howard, Greenwich
 Buisson, Charles, Bristol, Retired Livery Stable Keeper. April 26. Ben-
 son and Thomas, Bristol
 Carr, Alfred, Willington, Sussex, Gent. May 1. Hillmar, Lewes
 Commins, Thomas, Bodmin, Cornwall, Solicitor. June 24. Commins,
 Bodmin
 Crosbie, Charles, Florence, Italy, Esq. April 29. Raper and Freeland,
 Chichester
 Dees, James, Whitehaven, Cumberland, Esq. April 30. McKelvie,
 Whitenaves
 Dodd, Mary, Stoke-upon-Trent, Stafford. May 1. Tomkinson and
 Furnival, Burslem
 Done, Sarah, Fleur-de-Lis-street, Norton Folgate. April 17. Carritt,
 and Son, Fenchurch st
 Fletcher, Robert Robin, Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwick, Bank Man-
 ager. May 1. Hobbs and Sater, Stratford-upon-Avon
 Gamble, John Charles Corner, Blackheath, Kent, Gent. May 1. Haynes,
 Devereux court, Temple
 Goddard, John Knowles, Easton, Berks, Farmer. May 1. Peacock and
 Goddard, South square, Gray's inn
 Gore, Catherine, Bristol. May 1. Wynne and Son, Lincoln's inn fields
 Hardy, Parker, Penrith, Cumberland, Draper. April 30. Scott, Pen-
 rith
 Hatton, George Frederick Young, Hemingford rd, Baresbury, Gent.
 April 13. Withall, Threadneedle st
 Hook, Very Rev Walter Farquhar, Chichester. April 29. Raper and
 Freeland, Chichester
 Horsfall, John, Liverpool, Gent. May 1. Gardner and Smith, Liver-
 pool
 Houghton, Richard, Great Crosby, Lancashire, Merchant. April 29.
 Harvey and Co, Liverpool
 Lea, Charlotte Anne, Rose hill, Derby. April 7. Norton, Derby
 Lewy, Thomas, Sedlescomb, Sussex, Farmer. June 1. Langham and
 Son, Hastings
 Makin, Peter, Pendleton, Licensed Victualler. May 1. Haywood,
 Manchester
 Marshall, Thomas Bishop, Rampstone, Nottingham, Farmer. June 1.
 Parsons and Son, Nottingham
 Martin, Anne, Torquay, Devon. April 30. Auber, Bridgewater
 Meyrick, Owen John Augustus Fuller, Clifford st, New Bond st, Esq.
 June 24. Gray and Arnold, Whitehall place, Westminster
 Muggidge, George, South Daresuth, Kent, Farmer. April 20. Ras-
 sett and Co, Daresuth
 Naylor, Charles Todd, Cambridge terrace, Paddington, Esq. May 1.
 Whitakers and Woolbert, Lincoln's inn fields
 Pely, Charles Francis, Bristol, Gent. April 15. O'Donoghue and Son,
 Bristol
 Reoch, James, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Surgeon. May 10. Harvey,
 Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Ridyard, Alice, Walsden, Lancashire. April 15. Fielding, Bolton
 Roberts, Joan, Collyrn, Montgomery, Farmer. April 1. Minshalls and
 Jones, Oswestry, Salop
 Sadler, Henry, Drayton, Sussex, Gent. April 29. Raper and Freeland,
 Chichester
 Sanderson, James, Brecknock rd, Camden town, Land Agent. May 1.
 Nicholson and Herbert, Spring gardens, Charing cross
 Shoobert, David Jeremiah, Little North st, Whitechapel, Victualler.
 April 12. Flavell and Bowman, Bedford row
 Smith, Harry, Sutton Coldfield, Warwick, Farmer. May 1. Holbeche
 and Adenbrouke, Sutton Coldfield
 Soden, Jonathan, Langham st, St Marylebone, Gent. May 3. Briggs,
 Great James st, Bedford row
 Stott, Dorothy, Manchester. May 1. Heywood, Manchester
 Stuart, Henry Greville, Taunbridge Wells, Kent, Licensed Victualler.
 April 15. Cripps
 Swettenham, Wilhelmina Eaton, Horsham, Sussex. April 29. Raper
 and Freeland, Chichester
 Tilley, John, Putney, Surrey, Gent. April 25. Tanqueray-Williamme
 and Hanbury New Broad st
 Tongue, Sarah Jane, Bristol. April 26. Benson and Thomas, Bris-
 tol
 Tulloch, James Stewart, Pembroke place, Bayswater, Doctor of Medi-
 cine. April 30. Rooper, Lincoln's inn fields
 Tutton, Jane, Leeds, York. May 1. Middleton and Sons, Leeds
 Wallis, John, Bishopscarmouth, Durham, Master Mariner. April 15.
 Alcock jun, Sunderland
 Watts, Henry, Old Kent rd, Hot House Builder. April 30. Sisney,
 Sergeants' inn, Fleet st
 Wheatley, George, Gannford, Darham, Gent. May 1. Harrop,
 Swinton
 White, Henry Campbell, Huelecote, nr Gloucester, Esq. June 24.
 Indermaur, Devonshire terrace, Portland place
 Willey, George, Kidderminster, Worcester, Yeoman. April 10. Talbot,
 Kidderminster
 Woolgar, Sarah, Lewes, Sussex. May 1. Hillmar, Lewes

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80, 166½	Ditto 5½ per Cent., May, '79, '8
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent. Apr. '64
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88, 103 3d	Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '73
Ditto, ditto, Certificates —	Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
Ditto En-faced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 84	Ditto, ditto, under £1000
2nd Inf. Pr., 5 per C., Jan. '72	

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	137
Stock Caledonian	100	122½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	102
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	44
Stock Great Northern	100	135½
Stock Do. A Stock	100	135½
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock Great Western—Original	100	107½ 3d
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	135½
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	114½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	23½
Stock London and North-Western	100	143
Stock London and South-Western	100	121½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	70½
Stock Metropolitan	100	58½
Stock Do., District	100	45½
Stock Midland	100	135
Stock North British	100	101½
Stock North Eastern	100	156½
Stock North London	100	128
Stock North Staffordshire	100	68
Stock South Devon	100	69
Stock South-Eastern	100	124

* A. receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The Bank rate has been reduced from 4 to 3½ per cent., the proportion of reserve to liabilities having risen from 42 to 46½ per cent. In the foreign market the principal feature has been the panic in Egyptian stocks on the refusal by Mr. Disraeli to publish Mr. Cave's report, and the fall would have been even greater had there not been large purchases from Paris. The home railways have been very heavy, and although there is a recovery in most shares they still show a decline since last week. Consols close at 94½ to 94½ for money and 94½ to 94½ for account.

BIRTHS.

BYFIELD—March 18, at Tavistock House, Barnet, Herts, the wife of G. Dickinson Byfield, solicitor, of a son.
 DRUMMOND—March 20, at 3, Lyndhurst-road, Peckham, the wife of Patrick William Drummond, solicitor (formerly of Croydon), of a daughter.
 DYNE—March 20, at Coombe House, Hampstead-lane, Highgate, the wife of John Bradley Dyne, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
 FORD—March 20, at 164, Adelaide-road, N.W., the wife of Edward Ford, barrister-at-law, of a son.
 SOLOMON—March 19, at 2, Tavistock-road, Westbourne-park, the wife of Joseph Maurice Solomon, barrister-at-law, of a son.
 TREHEARNE—March 18, at Upper Richmond-road, Putney, the wife of A. T. Trehearne, solicitor, of a son.
 YOUNG—March 16, at 2, North Bailey, Durham, the wife of J. Griffith Young, solicitor, of a daughter.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, March 17, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Bog Mining Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before April 24, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William John Levington, Austinfrairs, Tuesday, May 2, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.
 British Guardian Life Assurance Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 11, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Saturday, March 25. Wynne, Cornhill, agent for Brabner and Court, Liverpool, solicitors for the petitioner.
 General Register and Meter Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before April 11, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to James Waddell, Mansion House chambers, Queen Victoria st. Friday, April 28, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.
 Halifax Worsted Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated March 16, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Williamson and Co, Sherborne lane, agents for Story, Halifax, solicitor for the petitioners.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Fourth Union Benefit Building Society.—Petition for winding up, presented March 13, directed to be heard before the V.C. at 6, Essex buildings, Lincoln's inn, on Tuesday, March 28. Evans and Lockett, Liverpool, solicitors for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, March 21, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

British Farmers' Pure Lined Cake Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 20, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on March 31. Goldring, Southampton st, Bloomsbury square, solicitors for the petitioners.

Grammes Magneto-Electric Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 15, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on Saturday, March 31. Rooks and Co, King st, Cheapside, solicitors for the petitioner.

Passenger General Register Company, Limited.—V.C. Bacon has, by an order dated Nov 15, appointed George Sneath, Gresham st, to be official liquidator.

Profit Insurance Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 20, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on March 31. Argles and Rayns, Gracechurch st, agents for Anderson and Argles, Paris, solicitors for the petitioner.

Southsea Floral Hall and Aquarium Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 17, directed to be heard before the M.R. on April 1. Edwards, Poultry, solicitor for the company.

United Bituminous Collieries Company, Limited.—V.C. Bacon has, by an order dated Nov 25, appointed Frederick Warwick, Buckenbury, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before April 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Tuesday, May 2, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, March 17, 1876.

Royal Standard Benefit Society, Northampton Arms, Northampton st, Cambridge rd. March 11

TUESDAY, March 21, 1876.

Benevolent Society, Dolphin Inn, Launceston, Cornwall. March 16

Free Trade Benefit Society, Rose and Crown, Trow, Hertford. March 16

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, March 7, 1876.

Child, George Henry, Lincoln st, Chelsea, Dairymen. March 31.
 Morris v Child, V.C. Malins. Few Surrey st, Strand.
 Dundonald, Thomas, late Earl of. March 31. Cockrane v Dundonald, V.C. Malins. Few and Co, Surrey st, Strand.
 Flanders, Henry, Newgate st, Furrer. April 11. Flanders v Stamp, V.C. Bacon. Boyer, Old Jewry chambers.
 Freeman, Elizabeth, Harpenden, Hereford. March 31. Freeman v Speckman, V.C. Malins. Beal, Sessions House, Clerkenwell.
 Hind, William, Narborough, Leicester, Gent. April 10. Hind v Robinson, V.C. Hall. Dalton and Salusbury, Leicester.
 Hoyte, Jane, Chilwell, nr Nottingham. April 4. Hoyte v Hoyte, M.R. Aston, Nottingham.

Kerr, Benjamin, Crick, Northampton, Sergeant. April 4. London Orphan Asylum v Paterson, V.C. Hall. Cattlin, Guildhall yard.
 Marston, Joseph, King square, St Luke's. April 10. Gilling v Naines, V.C. Hall. Boulton, Northampton square, Clerkenwell.
 Smith, James, Gateshead, Durham. April 1. Foster v Smith, V.C. Malins. Robson, Gateshead.
 Todd, John, Howard rd, South Hornsey, Stonemason. April 3.
 Todd v Atkinson, V.C. Bacon. Boulton and Sons, Northampton square.

FRIDAY, March 10, 1876.

Benson, Robert, Craven hill gardens. Elsewhere than in the United Kingdom. July 1. Benson v Benson, M.R. Pies, Old Jewry chambers.

Griffin, Thomas, Birdenbury fields, Warwick, Farmer. April 12.
 Rice v Griffin, M.R. Hawtin, Bunbury.
 Kettlewell, Richard, Minisk, York, Gent. April 11. Dawson v Horner, V.C. Bacon. Paley, York.
 King, Thomas, Hemingford rd, Islington, Cowkeeper. April 12.
 King v King, V.C. Hall. Howard and Co, New Bridge st.
 Payne, Amey, Bristol. March 28. Payne v Meade-King, V.C. Malins.
 Adams, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
 Payne, Whitefield Hols, Bristol, Gent. March 28. Payne v Meade-King, V.C. Malins. Adams, Lincoln's inn fields.
 Philips, Thomas, Sydney terrace, Sydney rd, Homerton, Gent. April 5.
 Martin v Shearman, V.C. Malins. Grout, Suffolk lane, Cannon st.

TUESDAY, March 14, 1876.

Child, Coles William John, Bromley, Kent, Esq. April 4. Child v Stahlshmidt, V.C. Malins. Latter, Bromley.
 Garwood, Charles, Arundel, Sussex, Gent. April 5. Barnard v Hardwick, V.C. Malins. Hardwick, Littlehampton.
 Hanson, John, Burton-on-Trent, Stafford, Wheelwright. April 17.
 Hanson v Hanson, M.R. Goodger, Burton-on-Trent.
 Herschhorn, Maurice, Castle st, Importer of Artificial Flowers. April 5.
 Herschhorn v Herschhorn, V.C. Hall. Mason, Gresham st.
 Smith, William Knight, South Mims, Middlesex, Farmer. April 18.
 Smith v Smith, V.C. Malins. Holland, Knight Kider st, Doctors' commons.
 Stephens, George, Plymouth, Devon, Gent. April 7. Stephens v Stephens, M.R. Fridham, Plymouth.
 Rawston, James, and Thomas Rawston, Aiden, Lancashire, Cotton Spinners. April 5. Rawston v Rawston, V.C. Malins. Woodcock, Haslingden.
 Sampson, George, Great Cambridge st, Hackney rd, Timber Merchant. April 12. Shorey v Sampson, M.R. Kindon, Lawrence lane, Cheapside.

FRIDAY, March 17, 1876.

Banks, William, Selby, York, Timber Merchant. April 15. Banks v Banks, M.R. Parker, Selby.
 Boyd, Robert Parker, Wellington, Somerset, Esq. April 19. Hoyt v Bigg, V.C. Hall. Robinson, Skipton.

Galley, Robert, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Snack Owner. April 20.
 Frost v Wood, V.C. Hall, Rayson, Great Yarmouth.
 Geo. Edward, Wisbeach Fer, Cambridge, Farmer. April 15. Laming
 v Smith, V.C. Hall. Thompsons and Co, Stamford
 Green, Joseph, Low-moor, Worcester, Innkeeper. April 17. Green v
 Green, V.C. Bacon. Corbett, Worcester
 Rogers, Richard, Sngual Hall, Stafford, Esq. April 10. Davey
 v Ward, V.C. Malins. Hawkford, Wolverhampton
 Hunt, Samuel, Denby, Derby, Yeoman. April 21. Fletcher v
 Ridsdale, V.C. Hall. Wheatcroft, Belper
 Jenkinson, John, Halifax, York, Gent. April 21. Wainman v Jenkin-
 son, District Registrar, Halifax. Barstow, Halifax
 Joyce, Samuel, Endsleigh at, Tavistock square, Esq. April 17. Joyce
 v Low, M.R. Baker and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 Monkhouse, John, Portobello rd, Notting hill, Grocer. April 20.
 Tomlin v Monkhouse, V.C. Hall. Snow, College hill, Cannon st.
 Preston, Elizabeth, Richmond, Surrey. April 15. Preston v Preston,
 V.C. Malins. Thomas, Martin's lane, Cannon st.
 Roberts, David William, Llanfairfechan, Carnarvon, Doctor of Medicine.
 April 11. Roberts v Hughes, M.R. Jones, Denbigh
 Strong, Richard, Southall-park, Middlesex. May 10. V.C. Malins
 Williams, Jane, Jun, Rathin, Denbigh. April 13. Williams v Jones,
 M.R. Adams, Rathin
 Winsler, James William, Croydton, Surrey, Coroner. April 15.
 Wiggins v Gardner, V.C. Bacon. Meadham, New inn
 TUESDAY, March 21, 1876.
 Bowers, Robert Arnold, Remford, Essex, Surgeon. April 17. Burrow
 v Chubb, M.R. Harvie New Broad st
 Brown, John, Bangor, Ireland, Ship Owner. April 15. Brown v
 Thompson, V.C. Malins. Pritchard, St Michael's buildings, Cornhill
 Ling, William, Hafield Peverel, Essex, Farmer. April 17. Bott v
 Taylor, M.R. Thomson, Cornhill
 Payne, Whitfield Hele, Bristol, Gent. March 20. Payne v Meade-
 King, V.C. Malins. Adams, Lincoln's inn fields
 Ford, John, Watling st, Woolton Warehouseman. April 15.
 London v Southall, V.C. Malins. Layton, Budge row
 Stewart, Donald, Gloucester terrace, Regent's park. April 20.
 McLaren v Parkinson, V.C. Hall. Campbell, Warwick st, Regent st
 Westrop, Sara Jane, Stoke Newington. April 19. Hull v Hill, V.C.
 Hall. Few and Co, Surrey st, Strand

Creditors under 28 & 28 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, March 14, 1876.

Andrew, Henry, Truro, Cornwall, Surgeon. April 20. Smith and
 Paul, Truro
 Brant, Emily, Reva, Brighton. April 8. Reeves, Essex st, Strand
 Brown, Samuel, Bloomsfield mews, Harrow rd, Cab Proprietor. April
 10. Apps, South square, Gray's inn
 Chapman, Rev John, Newport, Essex. May 27. Collin, Saffron
 Walden
 Chillingworth, Annie Wallwyn, Grendon Court, Hereford. May 1.
 Monckton and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 Cleyer, Joseph Edward, Leman st, Goodman's fields, Cooper. May 1.
 Biddleier and Sons, Leman st, Goodman's fields
 Connel, William Addison, Ealing, Middlesex, Gent. April 10. Cut-
 life, Jun, Cornhill
 Conist, Thomas, Witton, Norfolk, Gent. May 1. Wilkinson, North
 Walsham
 De'ier, Benjamin, Slough, Buckingham, Gent. April 11. Phillips,
 Windsor
 East, Marienne Frances Clayton, Stanhope place, Hyde park. April
 25. Budd and Son, Bedford row
 East, Richard, Cherry Willingham, Lincoln, Gent. April 1. Williams,
 Lincoln
 Golding, Arthur, Elmswell, Suffolk, Farmer. April 30. Golding,
 Walsingham-le-Willows
 Graham, Helen Anne Honora, Stranraer place, Malda vale. May 1.
 Woodroffe and Flakitt, New square, Lincoln's inn
 Grantley, Right Hon Fletcher Lord, Grantley Hall, York. April 15.
 Pridoux, Lincoln's inn fields
 Grundy, Hannah, Eastwood, Nottingham. May 1. Freison and Son,
 Sheffield
 Rippet, Margaret, Manchester. April 11. Potter and Lowe, Man-
 chester
 Hughton, George William, Inverness terrace, Esq. June 24. Johnson
 and Co, Austin filars
 Jullien, Susannah Faulconbridge Shipley, Arundel st, Coventry st.
 May 1. Chatterton, Ludgate hill
 Knowles, Edward, Bryn Hyfryd, Denbigh. May 6. Knowles, Liver-
 pool
 Lee, Daniel Green, Nottingham, Agent. April 20. Lees, Nottingham
 Lily, Joseph, Trinity square, Newington, Esq. May 1. Under-
 wood, Chancery lane
 Morgan, Anne, Brisbane, Queensland. April 1. Saben, Stone
 Harris, William, Pall mall, Near Admirals R.N. April 14. Carpenter,
 Regent st
 Oldfield, Edward, Bristol, Gent. April 22. Nunneley, Bristol
 Pease, Charles, Leeds, York, Joiner. May 1. Simpson and Burrell,
 Leeds
 Pury, Samuel, Manchester, Telegraph Agent. April 13. Hankinson,
 Manchester
 Pmblett, Henry Abel, Salford, Lancashire, Brick Maker. April 11.
 Potter and Lowe, Manchester
 Potter, Charles, Hackney rd, Bethnal green, Gent. April 24. Gepp
 and Sons, Cheshford
 Munie, Mungo Murdoch, Liverpool, Draper. Lynch and Teabay,
 Liverpool
 Rawstron, Thomas, Haslingden, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. April 5.
 Woodcock and Sons, Haslingden
 Roberts, Henriette Marie Felise, Paris. May 1. Newman and Co,
 Cornhill
 Rawlands, William, Marston, Stafford, Malster. April 8. Liddle
 Newport, Slop
 Argent, Sally Maria Sampson, Penge, Surrey. May 13. Finney,
 Chancery lane
 Ruttlewood, James, Stebbing, Essex, Farmer. April 15. Holmes, Bock-
 ing, Brainsree

Spencer, Thomas, Marlborough rd, Chelsea, Butcher. April 20. Tur-
 ner, Bedford row
 Stott, Charles, Manchester, Gent. April 13. Hankinson, Manchester
 Trenchard, John Trenchard, Ratpole, Dorset, Esq. May 8. Hume
 and Co, Great James st, Bedford row
 Willis, Henry, Warren st, Flaxey square, Civil Engineer. April 6.
 Lambert and Co, John st, Bedford row
 Witherington, Thomas, Worcester, Chemist. April 15. Jennings,
 Leadenhall st
 Yeates, George Henry Brettrarch, Brettrarch Holt, Westmorland. May
 1. Harrison and Son, Kendal

FRIDAY, March 17, 1876.

Bell, Thomas Brown, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. May 16. Hodge and
 Harle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Bissell, Ellen Mary, Reading, Berks. April 20. Thomas Owendon, Free-
 masons' Railway Tavern, Ladywell, Lewisham
 Bold, Edward, Brighton, Sussex, Commander R.N. May 1. Cooper
 and Williams, Brighton
 Boorn, George, Sidle-ham, Sussex, Yeoman. April 29. Raper and
 Freeland, Chichester
 Brown, Edmund, Wellington st, Depiford, Corn Dealer. April 29.
 Howard, Greenwich
 Bunson, Charles, Bristol, Retired Livery Stable Keeper. April 26. Ben-
 son and Thomas, Bristol
 Cast, Alfred, Willington, Sussex, Gent. May 1. Hillman, Lewes
 Commins, Thomas, Bodmin, Cornwall, Solicitor. June 24. Commins,
 Bodmin
 Crosbie, Charles, Florence, Italy, Esq. April 29. Raper and Freeland,
 Chichester
 Dees, James, Whitehaven, Cumberland, Esq. April 30. McKelvie,
 Whitehaven
 Dodd, Mary, Stoke-upon-Trent, Stafford. May 1. Tomkinson and
 Furlival, Burdon
 Done, Sarah, Fleur-de-Lis-street, Norton Folgate. April 17. Carritt,
 and Son, Fenchurch st
 Fletcher, Robert Robins, Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwick, Bank Man-
 ager. May 1. Hobbs and Sater, Stratford-upon-Avon
 Gamble, John Charles Corner, Blackheath, Kent, Gent. May 1. Haynes,
 Devereux court, Temple
 Goddard, John Knowles, Easton, Berks, Farmer. May 1. Peacock and
 Goddard, South square, Gray's inn
 Gore, Catherine, Bristol. May 1. Wynne and Son, Lincoln's inn fields
 Hardy, Parker, Penrith, Cumberland, Draper. April 30. Scott, Pen-
 rith
 Hatton, George Frederick Young, Hemingford rd, Barnsbury, Gent.
 April 19. Withall, Threadneedle st
 Hook, Very Rev Walter Farguair, Chichester. April 29. Raper and
 Freeland, Chichester
 Horsfall, John, Liverpool, Gent. May 1. Gardner and Smith, Liver-
 pool
 Houghton, Richard, Great Crosby, Lancashire, Merchant. April 29.
 Harvey and Co, Liverpool
 Lea, Charlotte Anne, Rose hill, Derby. April 7. Norton, Derby
 Lewry, Thomas, Sedlescomb, Sussex, Farmer. June 1. Langham and
 Son, Hastings
 Makin, Peter, Pendleton, Licensed Victualler. May 1. Heywood,
 Manchester
 Marshall, Thomas Bishop, Remstone, Nottingham, Farmer. June 1.
 Parsons and Son, Nottingham
 Martin, Anne, Torquay, Devon. April 30. Anber, Bridgewater
 Meyrick, Owen John Augustus Fuller, Clifford st, New Bond st, Esq.
 June 24. Crawley and Arnold, Whitehall place, Westminster
 Muggelridge, George, South Darnth, Kent, Farmer. April 20. Rus-
 sell and Co, Darnth
 Navler, Charles Todd, Cambridge terrace, Paddington, Esq. May 1.
 Whitakers and Woolbert, Lincoln's inn fields
 Pely, Charles Francis, Bristol, Gent. April 18. O'Donoghue and Son,
 Bristol
 Reoch, James, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Surgeon. May 10. Harvey,
 Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Ridyard, Alice, Walkden, Lancashire. April 18. Fielding, Bolton
 Roberts, John, Colfryn, Montgomery, Farmer. April 1. Minshalls and
 Jones, Oswestry, Salop
 Sadler, Henry, Drayton, Sussex, Gent. April 29. Raper and Freeland,
 Chichester
 Sanderson, James, Brecknock rd, Camden town, Laod Agent. May 1.
 Nicholson and Herbert, spring gardens, Charing cross
 Shobert, David Jeremiah, Little North st, Whitechapel, Victualler.
 April 12. Flavell and B-wman, Bedford row
 Smith, Harry, Sutton Coldfield, Warwick, Farmer. May 1. Holtheche
 and Addenbrooke, Sutton Coldfield
 Soden, Jonathan, Langham st, St Marylebone, Gent. May 3. Briggs,
 Great James st, Bedford row
 Stott, Dorothy, Manchester. May 1. Heywood, Manchester
 Stuart, Henry Greville, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Licensed Victualler.
 April 13. Cripps
 Sweetnam, Wilhelmina Eaton, Horsham, Sussex. April 29. Eips r
 and Freeland, Chichester
 Tiley, John, Putney, Surrey, Gent. April 25. Tanqueray-Williams
 and Hanbury New Broad st
 Tongue, Sarah Jane, Bristol. April 26. Benson and Thomas, Bris-
 tol
 Tulloch, James Stewart, Pembroke place, Bayswater, Doctor of Medi-
 cine. April 30. Cooper, Lincoln's inn fields
 Turton, Jane, Leeds, York. May 1. Middleton and Sons, Leeds
 Wallis, John, Bishopwearmouth, Durham, Master Mariner. April 15.
 Alcock, Jun, Sunderland
 Watts, Henry, Old Kent rd, Hot House Builder. April 30. Sismey,
 Serjeants' inn, Fleet st
 Wheatley, George, Gainsford, Durham, Gent. May 1. Harrop,
 Swinton
 White, Henry Campbell, Huecloote, nr Gloucester, Esq. June 24.
 Indermair, Devonshire terrace, Portland place
 Willey, George, Kidderminster, Worcester, Yeoman. April 10. Talbot,
 Kidderminster
 Woolgar, Sarah, Lewes, Sussex. May 1. Hillman, Lewes

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, March 17, 1878.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Bacon, Frederick, Ebony st, Plumico, Plumber. Pet March 15. Spring-Rice. March 28 at 1
 Munro, Andrew, Jun, House of Correction, Clerkenwell, no occupation. Pet March 13. Brougham. March 28 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Davies, Edward, Pochriw, Gellygare, Glamorgan, Innkeeper. Pet March 15. Russell. Merthyr Tydfil, March 28 at 11
 Davis, Joseph, Speightbury, Dorset, Miller. Pet March 13. Symonds. Dorchester, April 3 at 1
 Johnson, H. E., and H. Smits, Birmingham, Importers. Pet March 27. Cole. Birmingham, March 24 at 11
 Newman, Alfred William, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Builder. Pet March 14. Worlidge. Great Yarmouth, April 3 at 11
 Wyle, Jacob, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Pawnbroker. Pet March 8. Mortimer. Newcastle, March 30 at 11:20

TUESDAY, March 21, 1878.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Berry, Josiah, Basinghall st, Gent. Pet March 7. Hazlitt. April 5 at 12
 Green, William Charles, Abinndon villas, Kensington, Estate Agent. Pet March 17. Keene. April 3 at 11
 To Surrender in the Country.
 Cresdee, Sarah, and Charles Cresdee, Wareham, Dorset, Cattle Dealers. Pet March 17. Dickinson. Poole, April 3 at 12
 Senior, Allen, Huddersfield, York, Watch Dealer. Pet March 16. Jones, Jun, Huddersfield, April 6 at 11

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, March 17, 1878.

De'rymple, G. B. Chapel House, Kew, Gent. March 7
 Marshall, William, Talbot rd, Baywater, out of business. March 14

TUESDAY, March 21, 1878.

Barges, Gustav, City rd, Licensed Victualler. March 16

Liquidation by Arrangement.**FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.**

FRIDAY, March 17, 1878.

Allinson, Isaac, Frizington, Cumberland, Joiner. April 4 at 2 at offices of Atter, New Lowther st, Whitehaven
 Barnett, Joseph, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Tailor. April 1 at 11 at offices of Hill, Queen square, Wolverhampton
 Barrow, Isaac, Treowry, Glamorgan, Glazier. March 29 at 1 at offices of Alexander Brothers, Institute chambers, Pontypriid. Davis, Cardiff
 Barrowclough, Joseph, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Furniture Dealer. April 3 at 12 at offices of Free, Temple row, Birmingham
 Bracebridge, Joseph Dean, Over, Cheshire, Cooper. April 1 at 11:30 at the West Street Inn, Over. Fletcher
 Brazy, Sarah, Wakefield, York, Tailor. March 28 at 3 at offices of Horner, King st, Wakefield
 Blunkley, Charles, Manchester, Bagatelle Table Maker. March 29 at 3 at offices of Hankinson, St James's square, Manchester
 Boize, George, Mark lane, Wine Merchant. April 5 at 2 at offices of Gane and Jackson, Coleman st. Dubois, King st, Cheapside
 Bradley, Charles, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Carrier. April 4 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff
 Breger, Thomas Young, Stapleton, Gloucester, Commission Agent. April 3 at 12 at offices of Ward and Lane, Abidon chambers, Bristol
 Brooks, John, Penelton, nr Manchester, Ironmonger. April 4 at 3 at offices of Marriott and Woodall, Norfolk st, Manchester
 Brough, William Henry, Sandiham, Darnam, Engineer. March 30 at 11 at offices of Oliver and Sotterell, John st, Sanderland
 Brown, William, Ipswich, Suffolk, Confectioner. March 24 at 11 at Pearce's Rooms, Pines st, Ipswich. Boidas, Bishopsgate st without
 Buchner, Paul, St Mary Axe, Cigar Merchant. April 3 at 13 at offices of Crump and Son, Philip lane
 Buckley, Sarah, Farnworth, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. March 29 at 3 at offices of Richardson, Wood st, Bolton
 Buncombe, William, Great Dover st, Southwark, Skirt Manufacturer's Assistant. March 31 at 2 at offices of Poole, Bartholomew close
 Bandy, Thomas, Ross, Hereford, Blacksmith. April 4 at 3 at offices of Haines, St John's lane, Gloucester
 Cadcott, Charles, Birmingham, Paper Box Manufacturer. April 5 at offices of Horsham and West, 27, Waterson st, Birmingham
 Carlisle, James, Colversey, York, Coat Manufacturer. March 31 at 3 at offices of Malcom, Park row, Leeds
 Cartner, Isabella, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grocer. March 29 at 3 at offices of Jock, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Clough, James, Brewery Cellery, Darnam, Grocer. April 5 at 11 at offices of Bullock, Great bridge, Durham
 Cobb, Henry, Pontypriid, Glamorgan, Outfitter. March 31 at 12 at offices of Alexander Brothers, Institute chambers, Pontypriid
 Coe, Joseph, Stafford, Trunk Manufacturer. March 28 at 3 at the Vine Hotel, Stafford. Morgan, Stafford
 Defton, Ephraim, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Licensed Victualler. April 3 at 2 at offices of Downham, Market st, Birkenhead
 Dundas, James, Preston, Lancashire, Innkeeper. April 6 at 11 at offices of Thompson, Chapel st, Preston
 Edwards, David, Oswestry, Glamorgan, Collier. March 31 at 12 at offices of Hooper, Canon st, Abberdon
 Elliott, Joseph, Manchester, Dyer. March 29 at 4 at offices of Rylands and Barker, Rens st, Manchester
 Evans, John Ruch, Giffith, Builder. April 10 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff
 Fagg, Robert, Market, Sheffield, Grocer. March 31 at 4 at offices of One, The Tree chambers, Sheffield. Biss, Sheffield
 Ferry, William, and John Ferry, Ransington, Durham, Millers. April 3 at 11 at offices of Hines, West sunrise, Sunderland

Fisher, George, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Jeweller. March 25 at 11 at offices of Bush, St Nicholas buildings, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Forrest, Samuel, Holmforth, York, Boot Maker. March 31 at 3 at offices of Booth, John William st, Huddersfield
 Gilbert, Thomas, Cheapside, Pillow Case Manufacturer. March 21 at 11 at offices of Ladbury and Co, Cheapside. Carter, Anstis place
 Gilmore, James Patrick, Bradford, York, Grocer. April 5 at 10 at offices of Hennell, Tyrell st, Bradford
 Goodrich, George, Sheffield, Tailor. March 31 at 12 at offices of Legge, George st, Sheffield. Stacey, S. Sheffield
 Greenwell, Thomas, Tambridge Wells, Kent, Draper. March 30 at 11 at offices of Anderson and Sons, Ironmonger lane
 Hall, Anthony, Jun, Flamborough, York, Builder. March 31 at 3 at offices of Wray, Market place, Bridlington
 Harrison, Wordworth, Uverston, Lancashire, Esq. March 23 at 3 at the Temperance Hotel, Ulverston. Shinton
 Hawkwell, Alfred, Walsingham, Darnam, Wine Merchant. March 29 at 1 at offices of Labra, 110, Market place, B. and A. London
 Hedger, Andre, Morphett rd, Victoria park, Cabinet Maker. April 11 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Islington. Fenton, Albion terrace, Kingston
 Hemus, Frederick, Oaken Gates, Selop, Furniture Dealer. April 4 at 12 at offices of Macey and Son, Wellington
 Hilton, Arthur, Devonshire terrace, Forest hill, Clerk. March 29 at 4 at 35, Bedford row. Surtees
 Holmes, William, and John Thomas Holmes, Stamford, Lincoln, Grocer. March 29 at 1 at the Cannon st Hotel. Stapleton, Stamford
 Hughes, William Henry, Liverpool, Merchant. March 29 at 3 at offices of Barrell and Rodway, Lord st, Liverpool
 Hunter, Robert, Preston, Lancashire, Plasterer. March 30 at 3 at offices of Spencer, Chapel st, Preston
 Hurworth, David, Sunderland, Durham, Als Merchant. March 30 at 3 at offices of Graham, John st, Sunderland
 James, Robert, Squire, and Robert Farrar, Newton Heath, nr Manchester, Ironfounders. March 29 at 4 at offices of Cooper and Sons, King st, Manchester
 Jenkins, Henry, Norton, Derby, Carter. March 31 at 2 at offices of Ryalls and Son, North Church st, Sheffield
 Johnson, William, Framingham, Hought, Lancashire, out of business. April 11 at 11 at offices of Crowther, Booth st, Cooper st, Manchester
 Kaspar, Michel, Great Russell st, Bloomsbury, Merchant's Clerk. April 12 at 2 at offices of Arabians and Roffy, Old Jewry
 King, Frederick, and John Richard Adam, New Wauar rd, Clevedon rd, Pianoforte Manufacturers. April 4 at 2 at offices of Giffey, Gresham buildings
 Larn, John, Norwich, Draper. March 31 at 3 at the Home Trade Association Rooms, York chambers, York st, Manchester. Sile and Co, Manchester
 Leat, George Joseph Knight, Penzance, Cornwall, Milliner. March 29 at 11 at offices of Borlase and Milton, Clarence st, Penzance
 Lovering, Robert, Braunton, Devon, Yeoman. March 31 at 13 at offices of Benecart, Bridge chambers, Barnstable
 Mason, James, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford, Saddler. March 29 at 3 at offices of Griffith, Lad lane, Newcastle-under-Lyme
 Miller, James Calver, Lower Thames st, Fish Salesman. April 4 at 12 at offices of Tower, Lower Thames st
 Miller, Ulrich, and George Haynes Miller, Great Winchester st, Colindale Proprietors. March 28 at 2 at offices of James and Edwards, Cannon st, Blakie
 Milton, Richard, Manchester, Merchant. March 31 at 3 at offices of Gardner, Brown st, Manchester
 Morris, Thomas Henry, Bevis marks, Printer. March 31 at 2 at offices of Pass, Pancras lane, Quaker st, Cheapside
 Mowbray, Thomas William, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Tailor. March 30 at 11 at offices of Ma w, Jun, High Bongate, Bishop Auckland
 Muddle, Henry, High st, Shadwell, Licensed Victualler. March 31 at 3 at the Albion Tavern, High st, Sandwell. Wenn, Bell yard, Temple Bar
 Naylor, Isaac, Idle, York, out of business. March 29 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Markes st, Bradford
 Neary, William, Lacey rd, Barnardyston, Accountant. March 25 at 2 at offices of Bolton, Vauxhall rd, Camberwell New rd
 Newsome, James Johnson, Birmingham, Draper. March 28 at 11 at offices of Webb and Spencer, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
 Owen, Edward, Rusbon, Denbigh, Builder. March 30 at 3 at offices of Owen, Temple row, Wrexham
 Owen, Evan, Haggstone rd, Montgomery, Grocer. April 3 at 12 at offices of Williams and Co, The Bank, Newtown
 Page, Joseph, Lichfield, Farm Labourer. March 31 at 11 at offices of Adams, Goodall st, Walsall
 Pool, Thomas Ellis, St Erth, Cornwall, Merchant. March 31 at 3 at offices of Borlase and Milton, Clarence st, Penzance
 Puiar, Charles, Leeds, Shaw Dealer. April 3 at 12 at Wharfedale Hotel, Park lane, Leeds. Kirby and Son, Knaresborough
 Ramsall, Hannah, Liverpool, Bottle Merchant. April 4 at 2 at offices of Evans and Lockett, Liverpool
 Reynolds, Alfred, Brimham, Billiard Marker. March 31 at 13 at offices of Bunkle and Cluise, Waterloo rd, Birmingham
 Roberts, David Evan, Giffeloch, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 30 at 12 at offices of Rosser, Post-offices chambers, Pontypriid
 Robinson, John, Haggstone rd, Grocer. March 28 at 2 at offices of Ager, Barnard's inn, Holborn. Harrison, Goddard st, Dorset common
 Samuel, Louis, Manchester, Jeweller. March 31 at 3 at offices of Simpson, Kennedy st, Manchester
 Saunders, Henry Frederick, Liverpool, Ironmonger. March 30 at 3 at Gibbon and Bolland, South John st, Liverpool. Snowball and Co, Liverpool
 Scott, James, Warrington, Lancashire, Joiner. April 3 at 3 at offices of Boyle, Colport chambers, Warrington
 Sharp, Alfred, Dewsbury, York, Confectioner. March 31 at 9:30 at offices of Skipton, Union st, Dewsbury
 Sharp, Squire Mitchell, Middlesbrough, York, Auctioneer. March 29 at 3 at Barker's Temperance Hotel, Linthorpe rd, Middlesbrough. Bainbridge, Middlesbrough
 Shaw, Thomas, Brearley Jackson, William Lord, Josh Franco, and Robert Hill, Halifax, York, Machine Makers. April 3 at 3 at the Railway Hotel, Rastrot. Tennant and Haygar, Briggshaw

Baker, Thomas, Birmingham, Sewing Machine Manufacturer. March 30 at 1 at the Imperial Hotel, Robert Shaw st, Brackley Hill, Sheffield.
 East, Birmingham
 Smith, William Bruce, Sudbury, Suffolk, Surgeon. March 30 at 3 at offices of Cardinal, Sepulchre st, Sudbury
 Stanley, Charles, Walsall, Stafford, Butty Miner. March 29 at 11 at offices of Howlands, Ann st, Birmingham
 May Margaret Jane, East Allington, Devon, Grocer. April 5 at 12.30 at offices of Davey, Fore st, Kingsbridge
 Stubbs, Samuel, Witton, Cheshire, Grocer. March 30 at 11.45 at the Crown Hotel, Northwich, Pointon
 Budden, Robert, Howden, York, Plumber. March 28 at 12 at Bowman's Lane, Howden, Gill and Hall
 Temple, Edward, Crofton, Northumberland, Oldkeeper. April 4 at 11.30 at the Neville Hotel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Sidney and Son, Ryth
 Tessa, Louis, Leeds, out of business. April 3 at 3 at offices of Hopps and B. Lord, Bank st, Leeds
 Thurman, Charles Edward, Ipswich, Suffolk, Miller. March 31 at 12 at offices of Block, Silent st, Ipswich
 Tucker, Thomas, Ince, Manchester, Timber Merchant. March 31 at 11 at offices of Whitworth, St. James square, Manchester
 Wall, John Harmer, Wilton st, Finsbury, Dealer in Druggists' Sundries. April 6 at 2.30 at offices of Lewis and Whitbourn, Rasinghall st
 Ward, Edward, Hampstead rd, Potato Salesman. March 27 at 10.30 at offices of Evre, Chancery lane
 Waring, William, and Joseph William Sharple, Manchester, Spindle Makers. April 5 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Old Millgate, Manchester.
 Cooper and Sons, Manchester
 Weinbae, Jacob, Wagnor's buildings, Weaver's walk, Whitechapel, Dealer in Jewellery. April 6 at 4 at offices of Willis, Charles square, Hoston
 Wells, William, Otham, Lancashire, Cotton Waste Dealer. March 30 at 3 at offices of Ryalson and Barker, Essex st, Manchester
 Williams, Henry, Bristol, General Dealer. March 28 at 11 at offices of Murly and Sons, Old Post-office chambers, Corn st, Bristol
 Williams, Edmund, Manchester, Watch Maker. March 31 at 3 at offices of Shippey, Cooper st, Manchester
 Wilson, John, Maidenhead, Berks, Draper. March 30 at 11 at the Great Western Hotel, Paddington. Britton, Maidenhead
 Wisem, Thomas, Burslem, Stafford, Artificial Fruit Manufacturer. March 31 at 11 at offices of Julian, Wedgwood chambers, Burslem
 With B. Thomas, Nymphfield, Gloucester, Farmer. March 23 at 2 at the Spread Eagle Hotel, Gloucester. Cooke, Gloucester
 Woodcut, Peter Wright, Witton, Cheshire, Coal Merchant. March 29 at 11 at offices of Puntion, Market st, Crewe town
 Young, Thomas, Aylesbury, Buckingham, Publican. April 10 at 12 at offices of Feil, Aylesbury

TUESDAY, March 21, 1876.

Archer, William Henry, Peterborough, Northampton, Pianoforte Music Seller. April 3 at 12 at offices of Gaches, Cathedral gateway, Peterborough
 Atwater, Edward, Fisherton Anger, Wills, Brewer. April 5 at 12 at the Inn of Court Hotel, High Holborn. Hill
 Baker, Phineas, Highworth, Wilts, Saddler. April 3 at 11 at offices of Kinneir and Tombs, Corn Exchange, Swindon
 Bastie, James, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Iron Merchant. April 3 at 2 at offices of Sewell, Gray st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Bennett, William, Long Buckby, Northampton (and not Nottingham, as erroneously printed in Gazette of 14th inst.), Miller. March 29 at 3 at offices of Shooms, Nyland, Northampton
 Berridge, Arthur, Old Road, Cheshire, Butcher. April 4 at 11 at the Durham Ux Inn, West st, Congleton. Cooper, Congleton
 Bewley, John, Luddard Millicent, Wilts, Farmer. April 12 at 12 at offices of Kinneir and Tombs, Corn Exchange, Swindon
 Birch, John, Manningham, York, Grocer. March 27 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Duke st, Bradford
 Berg, Angelo, Swansea, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 30 at 3 at offices of John, Mount st, Swansea
 Birrell, Edmund, Cock yard, Kennington, Beershop Keeper. April 3 at 12 at offices of Foster, Blin in lane
 Burton, Thomas, Methley, nr Leeds, builder. April 4 at 3 at offices of Turner, East parade, Leeds
 Chapman, William, Roden st, Holloway, Builder. April 4 at 2 at 145, Chapsuise. Lindus, Chapsuise
 Overton, Charles, Birmingham, Printer. April 3 at 11 at offices of Ferry, Union passage, Birmingham. East, Birmingham
 Carr, James, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, Furniture Broker. April 6 at 3 at the Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds. Gros
 Clifton, Alfred Dixon, and Walter Hunt Clifton, Bedford, Brewers. April 12 at 12 at offices of Whyley and Piper, Dame Alice st, Bedford
 Cook, Joseph Solomon, Blackheath village, Kent, Hairdresser. April 10 at 12 at offices of Swaine, Chapsuise
 Curry, John, sen, and John Curry, jun, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Saddlers. March 31 at 2 at offices of Joels, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Curry, Henry, Christchurch, Hants, Fishmonger. April 3 at 2 at offices of Druitt, jun, Town Hall chambers, Bournemouth
 Davis, William, Birmingham, Electro Plate Maker. March 31 at 11 at offices of Ansell, Temple st, Birmingham
 Devereux, Thomas, Stone, Stafford, Clothier. April 6 at 11 at offices of Robinson, King st, Longton
 Dix, Rev Edward, Brampton, Huntingdon. April 7 at 3 at offices of Maile and Burton, Huntingdon
 Drake, Charles, Bueelos, Suffolk, Auctioneer. April 12 at 12 at offices of Maile, Hall Quay chambers, Great Yarmouth. Palmer, Great Yarmouth
 Durland, George, Bradford, York, Fruit Salesman. April 5 at 3 at offices of Hutchinson, Piccadilly, Bradford
 Durrant, Henry, Hadfield, Suffolk, Baker. April 4 at 12 at offices of Pollard, St Lawrence st, Ipswich
 East, George, Bishop Stortford, Herts, Grocer. March 30 at 2 at the Inns of Court Hotel, High Holborn
 Edwards, William Martin, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Licensed Vintner. April 4 at 11 at Sharp's Hotel, Strand, Barrow-in-Furness
 Fenn, Taylor, Barrow-in-Furness
 Gibson, Adam, Alfred Wilkins and Charles Laycock, Skipton, York, Bakers Turners. April 4 at 11 at the Devonshire Hotel, Skipton. Page, Skipton

Etches, Charles Thomas, Over, Cheshire, Watch Maker. April 10 at 4 at offices of Best, Lower King st, Manchester
 Estickness, Cornelius Thomas, Wrexham, Surrey, Builder. March 31 at 12 at the Lion and Lamb Hotel, West st, Farnham. Holles and Mason, Farnham
 Fisher, John, and Edward Fisher, Huddersfield, York, Woolen Manufacturers. April 10 at 11 at offices of Fisher and Sons, Brook st, Huddersfield. Laycock and Co, Huddersfield
 Foley, Thomas, Batley Carr, Dewsbury, York, Grocer. April 1 at 11 at offices of Shaw, Bond st, Dewsbury
 Francis, Richard, Walspool, Montgomery, Coal Dealer. April 4 at 1 at the George Hotel, Shrewsbury. Harrison
 Garforth, Jonathan, Ordsall, York, Brewer. April 1 at 3 at offices of Franklin, Harrison rd, Halifax
 Gething, Thomas Hanley, Lee, Kent, Outfitter. March 29 at 3 at offices of Seard and Son, Gracechurch st
 Gibbons, Henry, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. April 3 at 3 at offices of Pitt, the avenue, Cross, Worcester
 Gibbs, James Burgess, Halesbury rd, Canning town, Grocer. April 3 at 3 at offices of Aird, Eastcheap
 Goddard, Edward, Childs Oldford, Dorset, Grocer. April 3 at 11 at offices of Atkinson, Blanford Forum
 Goulden, Henry, Ilford Mill, Somerset, Mill'r. April 4 at 1 at offices of Hancock and Co, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol. Heaven, Bradford, Wilts
 Gowing, William, Liverpool, Outfitter. April 4 at 11 at offices of Elty, Lord st, Liverpool
 Gronow, Edward Miles, B. Idgend, Glamorgan, Tailor. April 3 at 2 at the Grand Hotel, broad st, Bristol. Stockwood, Jan, Bridgend
 Gwinhill, Henry, Langton-by-Wragby, Lincoln, Cordwainer. April 3 at 12 at offices of Clitheroe, Horncastle
 Hadlow, Fredrick, Lynsted, Kent, Baker. March 31 at 2 at 67, Prentiss st, Faversham. Johnson, Faversham
 Hall, Eliza, and Mary Ann Hall, Brighton, Sussex, School Proprietress. April 4 at 3 at offices of Nye, North st, Brighton
 Hancock, George, Sittingbourne, Kent, Bricklayer. April 4 at 11 at offices of Gibson, High st, Sittingbourne
 Haselinge, Charles, Fimborough rd, West Brompton, Commission Agent. March 31 at 12 at offices of Johnson, Seymour place, Marylebone rd
 Hilton, Joseph Wilson, Ryde, Cheshire, Bookbinder. April 14 at 11 at the Queen's Hotel, Hyde, Trawenham, Manchester
 Horrell, John William Richardson, Storminster Newton, Dorset, Auctioneer. April 4 at 1 at the Swan Hotel, Storminster New-on. Andrews and Pope, Dorchester
 Howard, Sarah Jane, Tarleton, Lancashire, Innkeeper. April 3 at 2 at offices of Forshaw, Cannon st, Preston
 Hughes, Robert, Dolgelly, Merioneth, Ironmonger. March 29 at 12 at the Townhall, Aberystwith. Jones and Davies, Dolgelly
 Hughes, William Hastings, and Charles Delley Hastings, Mark lane, Wills Merchants. April 4 at 1 at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate st within. Trinders and Hayward, Bishopsgate st within
 Hunt, Thomas, Pentrick Dock, Pembroke, Grocer. April 1 at 11.45 at the Guildhall, Carmarthen. Parry, Pembroke Dock
 Jack, Eilen, Liverpool, Boot Maker. April 6 at 2 at offices of Cleaver and Holden, Dale st, Liverpool
 Jackson, Julius, Liverpool, Clothier. April 7 at 3 at offices of Lowe, Castle st, Liverpool
 Jacobs, George, and Albert Samuel, Kington-upon-Hall, Hardware Dealers. April 3 at 3.30 at offices of Gamsell and Harvey, Gresham buildings, Guildhall. Lockyer, Gresham buildings
 Jenkins, James, Aberystwith, Cardigan, Butcher. March 29 at 11 at offices of Thomas, Little Dargate st, Aberystwith
 Jessop, Walter Sergeant, Dorton, Buckingham, Farmer. April 8 at 2 at offices of Reader and Sons, Auction Rooms, Temple st, Aylesbury. Reader, Gray's Inn square
 Johnson, Joseph, Thomas Johnson, and Joseph Johnson, jun, Bolton, Safford, Ironfounders. April 1 at 11 at offices of Fellows, Mount Pleasant, Bolton
 Major, Charles, Rotherham, York, Boot Dealer. April 1 at 11 at offices of Harrison and Sutton, Church st, Barasley. Senior
 Mann, Joseph, Halifax, York, Grocer. March 31 at 3 at offices of Jubb, Harrison rd, Halifax
 M. r. hall, Henry, Manningham, Bradford, York, Grocer. April 4 at 11 at offices of Singleton, New Booth st, Bradford
 Massey, Peter, Macclisfield, Harrow Maker. April 5 at 3 at offices of Barclay and Henstock, Exchange buildings, Macclisfield
 Milnes, Thomas James, Kidderminster, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. April 10 at 3 at offices of Saunders and Burcher, Church st, Kidderminster
 Moore, George, Burgh-in-the-March, Lincoln, Farmer. March 30 at 2 at the Fleece Inn, Burgh-in-the-March. Walker and Co
 Moore, Henry, Chew Magna, Somerset, Innkeeper. March 31 at 12 at office of Murly and Sons, Old Post-office chambers, Corn st, Bristol
 Murray, Edwin, High st, Poplar, Boot Manufacturer. April 13 at 3 at offices of Lewis and Lewis, Elly place, Holoorn
 Nice, Henry Edward, Hampstead rd, Cheesemonger. March 31 at 12 at offices of Bartlett and Forbes, Bedford st, Covent garden
 Nixon, Robert, Bradford, York, Drapers' Assistant. March 31 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Market st, Bradford
 O'Neill, Selina, North Tawton, Devon, Schoolmistress. April 3 at 12 at offices of Harris, Gandy st chambers, Exeter. Head, Exeter
 Pearson, John, Middlesbrough, York, Coal Merchant. March 31 at 3 at offices of Addenbrooke, Zealand rd, Middlesbrough
 Penn, Robert, sen, and Robert Penn, jun, Sunderland, Durham, Auctioneers. April 3 at 11 at offices of Oliver and Bottrell, John st, Sunderland
 Perkins, William Henry, William Fairhurst Ockleston, and Alfred Lodgegard, Manchester, Merchants. April 7 at 11 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Jones, Manchester
 Ferriman, Andrew, Bowling green st, Stone Merchant. April 3 at 2 at offices of Campbell, Cannon st
 Peters, Walter, Birmingham, Agricultural Implement Dealer. April 3 at 12 at the Midland Hotel, New st, Birmingham. Hawkes and Weeks, Birmingham
 Pilkington, Jonathan, Hatfield, Lancashire, Coal Agent. April 3 at 3 at offices of Sowerth, Town Hall square, Bolton

Pooley, William Alexander, Bush lane, Cannon st, Brewer's Agent. March 29 at 10 at offices of Harper and Co, Bond lane.

Proctor, William George, Wimborne Minster, Dorset, Cabinet Maker. March 31 at 3 at the King's Head Hotel, Wimborne Minster. Trevelion, Poole.

Prosser, John, Tredegar, Monmouth, Grocer. March 31 at 12 at offices of Rylands, Small st, Bristol.

Pye, James, Longridge, nr Preston, Lancashire, Cattle Dealer. April 12 at 3 at offices of Thompson, Chapel st, Preston.

Rhodes, Benjamin, Farsley, York, Wool Dealer. March 23 at 11 at offices of Rhodes, Duke st, Bradford.

Riddell, Henry Hunter, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Tea Merchant. March 31 at 3 at offices of Harle, Akenhead hill, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Rogers, Job, Ebbw vale, Monmouth, Bookseller. April 1 at 1 at offices of Simons and Pless, Church st, Merthyr Tydfil.

Rowland, John, Globe rd, Mile end, Accountant. April 1 at 10.15 at offices of Hicks, Globe rd, Mile end.

Rymer, Charles Joseph, Twickenham, Middlesex, no occupation. April 6 at 2 at 14, Old Jewry chambers, Russell and Co.

Schultze, Max, Bow lane, Chesham, Mantle Manufacturer. March 30 at 2 at offices of Agar, Gresham st.

Shallis, John Le Mars, Copenhagen st, Caledonian rd, Islington, Gent. April 3 at 12 at 9, Knightbridge st, Doctors' commons. Pritchard.

Sinnett, Isaac Hodges, Pembroke dock, Pembroke, Draper. April 1 at 10.15 at the Guildhall, Carmarthen. Parry, Pembroke dock.

Smith, Josiah, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Commission Agent. April 5 at 2 at the Victoria Hotel, Church st, Barrow-in-Furness.

Jackson.

Spratt, William, Jan, Green st, Bethnal green, Root Manufacturer. April 4 at 3 at offices of Eatin and Robinson, Coleman st. Christman, Walbrook.

Stanford, William, Eastbourne, Sussex, Provision Dealer. April 7 at 12 at 57, Terminus rd, Eastbourne. Sliff.

Stevenson, Charles, and Charles Seotney, Leicester, Coach Builders. April 5 at 2 at offices of Fowler and Co, Greyfriars chambers, Friar lane, Leicester.

Sutcliffe, Job, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Provision Merchant. March 29 at 2 at offices of Sewell, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Talbot, James Walsh, and Henry Albert Goss, Plymouth, Devon, Coal Merchants. April 11 at 11 at offices of Elworthy and Co, Courtenay st, Plymouth.

Torckler, William Young, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Teacher of Languages. April 15 at 11 at 326, High st.

Turner, John, Macclesfield, Cheshire, Silk Throwster. April 5 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Macclesfield. May.

Underwood, John, High st, Camden town, Modeller. April 4 at 2 at offices of Barrett, Bell yard, Doctors' commons.

Vassant, George, Beckenham, Kent, Soldier. April 4 at 3 at offices of Andrews and Mason, Ironmonger lane, Chesham. Bristow.

Walling, Sampson, Littlehampton, Sussex. April 6 at 3 at offices of French and Co, Littlehampton.

Walter, William, South Shields, Tobacconist. April 3 at 2 at offices of Osborne, East King st, South Shields.

Webb, Robert, and Alfred James Fitch, High Wycombe, Bucks, Drapers. April 4 at 2 at offices of Broad and Co, Queen st, Chesham.

Rawson, Great Marlow.

Weir, Edward Ross, Salford, Lancashire, Joiner. April 3 at 11 at offices of Hodgson, Tib lane, Manchester.

West, George Thomas Williams, Alcombe, Somerset. April 5 at 11 at the Wellington Hotel, Minehead. Watkins, Alcombe.

Williams, John, Tongwynlais, Glamorgan, Grocer. April 6 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff.

Williams, Thomas, Norfolk terrace, Bayswater, Ha'tter. April 3 at 12 at offices of Jones and Hall, King's Arms yard, Coleman st.

Wilson, Robert, Oswestry, Salop, Fruiterer. April 6 at 3 at offices of Simmons, Bennett's hill, Birmingham.

Witney, Thomas, New Kent rd, Tailor's Cutter. March 28 at 3 at offices of Bliton, Vassall rd, Camberwell New rd.

Wulff, Henry Augustus William, Birmingham, Watch Maker. April 3 at 10.30 at offices of Buller and Bickley, Moor st, Birmingham.

Yewdale, William, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Greengrocer. March 31 at 11 at offices of Fleming, Grainger at west, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

LEGAL MANUAL FOR LAW STUDENTS AND GENERAL LEGAL PRACTITIONERS.

Now ready, in 12mo, price 3s. 6d., cloth.

OUTLINES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE: being a Concise Treatise on the House of Lords, the Court of Appeal, and the High Court of Justice, and the Procedure and Practice therein. With Notes. By EDWARD STANLEY ROSCOE, Barrister-at-Law. London: LONGMANS & Co.

BEDFORD'S FINAL GUIDE TO PROBATE AND DIVORCE.

Just published, post 8vo, 4s., cloth.

THE FINAL EXAMINATION GUIDE to the Law of Probate and Divorce, containing a Digest of Final Examination Questions, with the Answers. By EDWARD HENSLÖWE BEDFORD, Solicitor, Editor of the "Preliminary," the "Intermediate," and the "Final." London: BUTTERWORTHS, 7, Fleet-street, Her Majesty's Law Publishers.

This day, Fourth Edition, in one thick vol., royal 8vo, 45s., cloth.

THE LAW OF SLANDER and LIBEL (founded upon Starkie's Treatise), including the Pleading and Evidence, Civil and Criminal, adapted to the present procedure; also, Malicious Prosecutions, and Contempts of Court. By H. C. FOLKARD, Barrister-at-Law. London: BUTTERWORTHS, 7, Fleet-street.

Just published, price 2s. 6d., cloth, by post for 30 stamps.

THE AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT (1875), 38 & 39 Vict., cap. 92; with Introduction, Notes, and Index. By GEORGE SILLS, M.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge, and of Lincoln's Inn and the Midland Circuit, Barrister-at-Law. London: DAVIS & SON, 57, Carey-street, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED)

Established in 1835.—Capital, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Aggra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms customary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit balance does not fall below £100.

DEPOSITS received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:—At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' notice of withdrawal. For shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

BILLS issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sold for collection.

SALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken. Interest drawn, and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realised.

Every other description of banking business and money agency, British and Indian, transacted. J. THOMSON, Chairman.

Valuable Shares in the Law Life Assurance Society.

MR. ROBERT REID WILL SELL at the MART, on FRIDAY, APRIL 21, at ONE for TWO o'clock precisely, in Five Lots, by order of the Executors of the late Joseph William Thrupe, Esq., TWENTY-FIVE £100 SHARES in the LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY, on which £10 each has been paid, and a sum representing the remaining £90 on each share accumulated out of the past profits remains in the hands of the Company, so that no further call can be made on the purchaser. The dividends of £4 3s. per share are payable half-yearly, in April and October. There is a quinquennial division of profit by way of bonus, which, at the rate of the last division, would amount to nearly £12 per share.

Particulars may be had of Messrs. BURGONYNES, MILNES, BURGOYNE, & THRUPE, Solicitors, 160, Oxford-street. W.; at the Mart, E.C.; and of Mr. ROBERT REID, 48, Great Marlborough-street, W.

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice.

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use. MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily prepared in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps. Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.

RICHARD FLINT & CO.

(Late ASH & FLINT),

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn).

Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.

EDE AND SON.

ROBE MAKERS.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Robes Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS &c.

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

YATES & ALEXANDER,
PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,
ETC.
CHANCERY-BUILDINGS, 23, CHANCERY-LANE,
LONDON.

Every description of Printing.

Judicature Affidavits	Catalogues
Appeals	Prospectuses
Parliamentary Minutes	Magazines
Books	Newspapers
Pamphlets	Circulars
Reports	Posters
Rules	Handbills, &c., &c.

CARR'S, 265, STRAND.
Dinner (from the joint) vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d., or with Soup or Fish, 2s. and 2s. 6d. "If I desire a substantial dinner of the joint with the agreeable accompaniment of light wine, both cheap and good, I know only of one house, and that is in the Strand, close to Danvers Inn. There you may wash down the roast beef of old England with excellent Burgundy, at two shillings a bottle, or you may be supplied with half a bottle for a shilling."—All the Year Round, June 18, 1866, page 400.

The new Hall lately added is one of the handsomest dining-rooms in London. Dinners (from the joint), vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d.

RE.

(D)

DOM

Agm

can

creat

-

trans

spen

under

r and

ter, in

take

and.

gend

am,

ET,

ly, in

crapp,

ANCE

ating

radius

a in

vable

ion of

would

UPP,

ough-

7.

action

e use

critic

CEB

ICIAL

Com

Flatt

.

Donch

.

S M

NE,

NE,

.

.

h Som

he join

up and

Don

d with

applie

3, 196

orma